

THE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW

VOL. 257.

COMPRISING Nos. 509, 510

PUBLISHED IN

JULY & OCTOBER 1931.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

NEW YORK:

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY

1931

A NEW SHELTER—

A BOON TO HOMELESS WOMEN

PUBLIC LIBRARY

590823 A

ASTOR, LENOX AND

TILDEN

1932

LIFE'S ROUGHEST HANDLING takes from no one the innate longing for home. Imagine, if you can, the sufferings and anxieties of the poor friendless woman who finds herself alone—penniless, HOMELESS. Thousands in such dire straits have been grateful for the hospitality provided by The Salvation Army Shelter in Hanbury Street, Whitechapel. To-day, however, the accommodation is sadly inadequate, and the Army is compelled to extend, to meet an urgent need.

A large building has been secured, and is being remodelled

TO ACCOMMODATE NEARLY 300 WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

One of the two dining and rest rooms will seat no less than 250.

Here will be a home where poor women may live in wholesome and homelike surroundings at nominal cost (free in some cases) with the free use of baths, laundry, ironing room, hot water, locker for personal effects, perambulator garage, etc.

THIS URGENT NEED FOR EXTENSION

of the new Hanbury Street Shelter is a very real one. May we ask that the joy of your own home will prompt you to give something towards this HOME for the HOMELESS?

Contributions, large or small, will be gratefully received by GENERAL EDWARD J. HIGGINS,

**£20,000
NEEDED**

**TO OPEN FREE
OF DEBT**

**Assets or
Liabilities?**

Considerable publicity has been given to the subject of the Salvation Army's PROPERTIES. It must be remembered, however, that the many Institutions are merely THE MACHINERY by means of which the Army is able to help the suffering and the destitute.

FOR MAINTENANCE ALONE a considerable sum must be raised every year.

THE SALVATION ARMY

101, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 509.—JULY, 1931.

Art. 1.—SOME NAVAL HERESIES.

1. *Economy and Naval Security.* By Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond. Benn, 1931.
2. *The Navies of To-day and To-morrow.* By Captain Bernard Acworth, D.S.O., R.N. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1931.

THE aftermath of the London Naval Conference came as something of a relief from a period of intensive comparisons of international interests and requirements, and jealous measuring of naval strengths by a variety of 'yardsticks.' But the Treaty which has been signed is, in its essentials, only a three-party agreement, even if by a piece of diplomatic sophistry it bears the signatures of five Powers. It is, at best, a patchwork affair, and the passage of months has brought realisation that the United States alone has got much satisfaction from it. America came to the Conference invoking the Kellogg Pact as the last word in outlawing war; she ended by securing agreement among the contracting parties to the principle that, for her, security means a bigger navy than she has ever possessed before and 'parity' on an arithmetical basis in naval strength with the one nation with whom war is proclaimed to be unthinkable. What a paradox!

As a natural corollary to this situation, Japan felt obliged to indent for a bigger navy than she can conveniently afford, and even so has been left in a position which a large and patriotic section of her people regard as being a grave menace to her security. France, with an independence of spirit and a practical outlook on this, as on other of her defence problems, which we should do well to emulate, has refused to be beguiled by high sounding

Vol. 257.—No. 509.

phrases and specious gestures. She requires more definite assurances, and failing to get them, is keeping herself free from any serious restrictions other than those to which she was already committed under the terms of the Washington Treaty. Italy will, so far, be content with no less than France.

But to satisfy the United States and to save the amour-propre of Mr Ramsay MacDonald, the Treaty was signed, and it has left the British Empire with a navy definitely inadequate for our normal defence and for upholding our sea interests amongst other nations. The situation is infinitely more serious and more dangerous than most people realise, because not only have we allowed the sea Service already to fall below the safety margin—a habit of ours after every great war—but we have pledged ourselves not to improve our position unless an emergency arises. Who is to judge whether there is an emergency? The influences to refute every suggestion that an occasion has arisen when we must take abnormal measures will be very strong, and the result may well be that our very weakness will lead to war where our strength would have prevented it. Moreover, if we are too feeble to cast our weight effectively on the side of peace, we may be dragged into war ourselves, either under the terms of the Locarno Pact or through sheer necessity, because we dare not take up an independent attitude. If we are the victims of such circumstances as these—circumstances largely of our own making—we shall enter that war with our one really vital weapon too short to strike, too weak to defend. Once again we shall have to expend the whole resources of the Empire before we recover from our bad start; once again it will be a long war, an expensive war, because we are not ready; once again we shall have to build the imperial house of prosperity on its economic ruins, because we would not pay for a fully-equipped fire-brigade before the fire broke out. Such, with no exaggeration, is the position in which we are left as the result of the London Naval Conference. But, even so, our pathetic contentment may lead to our being left in an even worse position after the forthcoming Disarmament Conference unless the nation can be roused to take a more lively interest in these matters.

Mr Alexander, First Lord of the Admiralty, recently

presented his Co-operative Congress with some sound views when he said :

' We have to face the fact that you can never hope to obtain permanent peace by means of unilateral disarmament . . . secondly, you must remember that if you abolish all the armies and navies to-morrow, without the will for peace, the possibilities of industrial organisation for war can be harnessed for bloody warfare in a few weeks.'

But Mr Henderson, with his more idealistic outlook, is to be the chairman of the International Disarmament Commission at Geneva. It is all the more important, therefore, that our parliament, press, and people should not be as indifferent to this matter as they were at the time of the London Conference.

Interest in our naval policy has been slightly stimulated lately by one or two naval writers who, whatever else may be said about them, have at least provoked criticism and discussion. Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond in his ' Economy and Naval Security ' has outlined a futurist—or should it be socialist—design of fleet, which, he claims, will save millions in naval armaments by the simple expedient of reducing the maximum size of any warship to 6500 tons. This, he assures us, would not mean any loss of security for our own, or apparently any other country. In passing, it may be noted that he finds in an article on ' The Predominant Surface Ship ' by the present writer* an admonition against himself, as one of those who are not in ' a responsible position,' expressing original opinions. This was neither said nor implied; it was merely noted that the attitude of the representatives of the British Government at the London Naval Conference towards the future of the capital ship seemed to be much in accord with a certain writer on the subject, and not in accord with their official advisers, whose responsibilities the author of those views did not have to share. It is always easy to propound idealist theories, if one is not hampered by responsibility for putting them into practice, or for their after effects; but it is questionable whether the time was opportune for encouraging our political idealists, who, in the opinion of very many, were, and are, too prone to gamble with the safety of the Empire.

* ' Quarterly Review,' April 1930.

Now, however, Admiral Richmond's proposals can be examined at leisure before the next naval conference, as this is not due until 1935, unless, of course, the same controversy arises at the forthcoming Disarmament Conference.

But before starting to design a new fleet, we should be clear as to what is required of that fleet in years to come. Is it to be regarded primarily as part of an international force, a force intended to be used by the 'good nations' for the castigation of any delinquent Powers who may not conform to the precepts of the League of Nations? If so, perhaps there is much to be said for warships of a more or less sealed pattern, as small and as cheap as possible; for surely it may be taken for granted that Britain will always be co-operating with the majority of Powers—the 'good nations'; therefore she has nothing to fear herself, and her quota towards the League's navies may well be as economical as is compatible with her dignity. So might argue our idealists and our pacificists, and such views might meet with considerable favour amongst those who see in every reduction of armaments the nearer approach to Utopia. Unfortunately, 'economy and naval security' cannot be attained by the simple process of abolishing all warships over 6500 tons and starting all the sea Powers off on a new and lower plane, as it were, for the simple reason that international relations are not yet so imbued with brotherly love that there is any prospect of general agreement to such a policy.* Admiral Richmond's advocacy of 'little ship' navies might, therefore, be taken as scarcely more than a harmless academical exploration of the potential results of such an agreement, were it not that he may influence those of a less practical turn of mind to believe that we ourselves should lead the way towards this Utopian state.

Another naval writer also urges drastic reduction in the size of capital ships, and Captain Acworth in his 'Navies of To-day and To-morrow' advocates a battleship of 12,000 tons and auxiliary types proportionately

* As the answer to the new German ship of 10,000 tons with six 11-inch guns, France has designed a vessel of 23,000 tons with eight 12-inch guns; the United States will not undertake to limit future capital ship construction even to this displacement.

reduced in size and cost. But in arriving at his conclusions he specifically disregards 'any existing ships in our own or foreign navies.' He invites naval officers to think and plan on an *absolute* foundation and not on a *relative* one, and blames Lord Fisher—whom he regards as being chiefly responsible for the erroneous policy we have been pursuing for some thirty years—for failing to design our ships on this principle. Here is a fundamental defect in this writer's premises, for as Admiral Richmond rightly says, 'the strength of a navy is conditioned by two things, the one absolute, the other relative. In so far as it is absolute it is partly governed by the extent and the distribution and the importance of that which it is required to defend ; in so far as it is relative, by the strength and nature of those forces by which its interests may be attacked.' For those who believe that imperial requirements, and not international interests, should decide our future naval policy, this is a sound basis on which to build when determining the number, the size, and the character of the units of our fleet.

As regards our 'absolute' naval requirements, these can be summarised simply as follows :—

In peace— Our fleet must be able to police the seas so that ships, irrespective of nationality, may voyage safely on their lawful occasions ; also our Navy must be such a factor in the balance of power that it will continue to act as a weighty influence against any disturbance of the world's peace.

In war— Our fleet must be able to safeguard the seas for friendly ships, and deny them to unfriendly ships.

To meet these requirements we need a sufficiently large *number* of ships to ensure that our sea security cannot receive a mortal blow in any part of the world, and the size and character of those ships must be such as will suit them for the duties they have normally to perform and the potential enemy ships they may have to fight. Here it should be noted that there is only one form of weakness more dangerous than that due to a lack of the requisite number of ships, and it is that the ships themselves should be inferior in fighting qualities to those of any foreign Power. To secure strategical requirements in numbers at the expense of tactical essentials as regards weapons, speed, and protection, is an indefensible policy.

Admiral Richmond quotes Mahan as saying, 'historically, good men with poor ships are better than poor men with good ships,' but what neither of these distinguished authors has emphasised is the fact that 'good men with poor ships' will have no chance whatever under modern conditions against 'good men with good ships.' An heroic contempt for superior weapons may have been justifiable in the days of sail, when there was more scope for marked superiority in strategy, tactics, and personal valour to make up for material deficiencies; but to adopt such an attitude to-day is to show ignorance of modern weapons—not only as regards their intrinsic power, but still more their practical usage.

Too often a good deal of play is made with these terms 'strategy' and 'tactics,' to say nothing of that nebulous phrase, 'sound principles.' While giving an impression of superior mentality to the less self-reliant student, certain writers avoid the concrete and the practical by surrounding their arguments with an aura of generalisations and historical quotations. The 'sound principle' that the primary object of our navy must be the defeat of the enemy's main fleet is the product of a limited outlook. The object in war must vary with each stage in the scale of responsibility and command: for example, the object of the nation is to win the war; that of the Government to force the enemy to sue for peace; that of the Admiralty to use the naval forces in such fashion as will most disconcert our opponents while safeguarding our sea security; foremost amongst the means of effecting the latter is a successful naval action. The object of the naval commander-in-chief is to sink the enemy's fleet—if opportunity occurs—failing that to paralyse its activities.

Other 'sound principles' often take the form of mere abstract ideas such as 'economy of force, or forces,' 'concentration,' 'surprise,' and so forth, which unless they are translated into more definite guides to action merely serve to give the student mental indigestion. It is very doubtful whether the really successful commander is continually applying such tests to his strategy as 'am I observing the principle of security?' or 'have I remembered the example of Napoleon on some particular occasion?' or 'does my plan conform to the doctrines of

Clausewitz ?' He may have educated himself by reading history, but he probably acts from an instinctive knowledge of what the situation demands, based on good intelligence and a thorough appreciation of the potentialities of his forces and their weapons. Again, there is an extraordinary amount of loose thinking and pointless writing on the subject of strategy, and the materialist, who ultimately has to produce the actual designs and the finished article whereby the enemy is to be defeated, is abused because he is not a strategist. Captain Acworth argues that Lord Fisher's materialism resulted in a 'revolutionary and fallacious doctrine of sea warfare. A fleet in being, a fleet of great material superiority, was to be regarded as an acceptable substitute for a decisive victory at sea, a doctrine which looked to a Jutland rather than a Trafalgar for the maintenance of our sea supremacy.' This is not merely ludicrous as applied to the man whose gospel was 'you must hit first, you must hit hard, and you must keep on hitting,'* but libellous as applied to the high command of our Grand Fleet. It may not be generally known, but it should be to any naval writer who sets out to give his views on such matters, that just before Jutland Jellicoe had prepared a bold plan to entice the German fleet out of harbour in order to bring them to action. This was, briefly, to send two cruiser squadrons down the Kattegat as far as the Great Belt and the Sound, and a battle squadron to push into the Skaggerak in support.† This he conceived would be such an irresistible bait that it could not fail to draw a strong enemy force into the Bight, and he hoped sufficiently far to the Northward for the battle fleet and battle cruiser fleet, which would be cruising in readiness, to engage them. The first move to give effect to this scheme was due to take place on June 2, but Scheer put to sea on May 30 to carry out a plan of his own whereby he hoped to entrap part of the British forces; needless to say he did not expect or intend to engage the whole Grand Fleet. The result was that Jellicoe's plan never had to be put into effect, but the two fleets met at Jutland.

To compare Jutland with Trafalgar savours of some

* Sir John Fisher's speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet, 1907.

† 'Official History of the War—Naval Operations,' vol. III, p. 320.

of the worst journalistic effusions on the former battle which for a time disgraced the more sensational section of our daily Press. The conditions, as every naval student knows now, were totally different. True, Scheer claimed afterwards that he emulated the tactics of Nelson during one phase of the action, but in fact he did so involuntarily, and the very few minutes during which he found himself engaged in a head-on assault served to convince him that, whatever its merits in the eighteenth century, such a method of engaging would mean annihilation in the nineteenth. Because Jellicoe—like every other admiral, German as well as British—turned away momentarily from a concentrated torpedo attack, there is not the smallest justification for saying that there was any less eagerness to come to grips with the enemy at Jutland than there was at Trafalgar; but at Jutland the main fleets were not in contact until after 6 p.m., while the battle of Trafalgar opened before noon. In the prevailing low visibility and under the conditions governing a modern fleet action, it was impossible for Jellicoe to fight to a finish in less than three hours before nightfall; but he made all preparations to resume action at daybreak. How the German fleet escaped in the night is another story,* but it was not due to any policy of preserving the Grand Fleet 'in being' rather than seeking victory in battle.

This digression is mainly to show how history can be suppressed, distorted, and perverted to give specious support to predetermined conclusions.

Having awed the student with 'sound principles,' muddled him with historical examples, which may or may not be applicable to strategy in the present day, the pontifical writer is then wont to complete his reader's mystification by much use and abuse of the term 'tactics.' It is evident that more often than not naval tactics are visualised in the form of the relative dispositions and movements of black and white slug-like shapes representing our own and the enemy's fleets on the tactical board; whereas all tactics should be derived from fire effect, and on the tactical board white and black circles should be superimposed on the black and white slugs to represent the fire effect from minute to minute. Only by some such

* See 'Jutland: The Real Story,' 'Quarterly Review' of January 1924.

means as this will our highbrow tacticians and strategists be forced to realise the importance of the weapon and of the instruments by which it is laid and discharged, and the real effect of the movements of the white slugs, i.e. the ships, in assisting or disturbing the system by which fire is controlled. Then only will they have to come down to earth and realise that ultimately it is fire effect—the means of producing it and the powers of resisting it—which matters more than all the abstract theories of war put together. Now fire effect is the product of :

- (a) Guns—their size, rate of fire, and the quality of the shell and propellants.
- (b) Control of gunfire—ranging, laying, and spotting.
- (c) Concentration or dispersion of the fire of our own ships on those of the enemy.

If the first of these only had to be considered there might be a good deal to be said for mounting the guns on many small platforms rather than on a few larger ones, on the principle of having numerous baskets to carry the eggs. But the fundamental requirements of naval tactics demand attention to the two other factors. Until the adoption of the system of firing guns in simultaneous salvos by a master sight in a commanding position—known as Director firing—the British Navy had no really effective means of ensuring that all the guns, even in the same ship, were fired consistently at the proper target ; * ‘ concentration of fire ’ existed more as a tactical conception than as a practical proposition. To-day concentration by two or more ships on the same enemy is possible, *but* the fire effect of twelve guns, let us say,

* Captain Acworth, in ‘ The Navies of To-day and To-morrow ’ (p. 86), alludes to ‘ the actual gunlayers . . . sunk into the undignified rôle of machines, their magnificent skill and judgment . . . replaced by instruments controlled and set on information offered by a variety of junior ratings, often boys.’ In practice the guns are now laid by a kind of super-gunlayer—in big ships for the primary armament he is a warrant officer—at the master sight, where he can see, instead of in the old-fashioned way by several gunlayers, one to each gun, where they were blinded by smoke and splashes and could never be sure of firing at the proper target. Under battle conditions it was quite impossible for the local gunlayer to distinguish his own shots, and he could not exercise any of the ‘ magnificent skill and judgment ’ he might have displayed at short-range target practice. Highly trained officers control the gunfire. Boys, under supervision, are employed on less important duties, as they have been since the days of ‘ powder-monkeys.’

mounted in one ship, will generally be better than that produced by twelve guns of the same size mounted six in each of two ships, and much better than that of four mounted in each of three ships. A mixed armament of guns of different sizes in the same ship is very difficult to control and produces a very poor fire effect with much waste of ammunition. This was one of the most serious defects from a tactical point of view in the pre-*'Dreadnought'* battleships, but few of Lord Fisher's critics were aware of the fact, and many do not realise it to-day.

The grouping of the guns to obtain the best fire effect from each salvo is another important matter. Within practical limitations, eight guns mounted in four turrets is the most effective arrangement. Captain Acworth's battleships and cruisers suffer, amongst their other defects, from having only six guns, which means that normally there will be only three shots in their salvos. He is undecided whether to mount them in three twin or two triple turrets. It can be said at once that experience has shown that twin turrets are definitely better than triple turrets. The latter are a concession to the ship designer in order to save weight, but they mean some loss of gunnery efficiency. As regards size of guns, we cannot ignore, as this writer does, the size of the enemy's weapons. If the difference in the rate of firing 16-inch and 13·5-inch guns were so great that the ship armed with the former could only discharge them intermittently while an enemy mounting the latter rained almost continuous salvos with her lighter weapons, there might be something to be said for the smaller gun; but in practice it merely means that, other things being equal, the fleet firing the lighter shells is at a tactical disadvantage.

Working back from the business end of all tactics, we must realise the simple truth that our fire effect will be nil if we cannot get the enemy within range, and greatest if we attain such a position that we can hit him a lot while he can only hit us a little. To design a battle fleet which can never engage the enemy unless he obligingly comes to be engaged, as Captain Acworth proposes,*

* The 'natural maximum speed' of Captain Acworth's proposed battleship is 17½ knots; that of the *'Nelson'* is 23; of the United States *'Colorado'*, 22; of the Japanese *'Mutsu'*, 23·5 knots; and of the new German pocket battleship, 26 knots.

would be the height of folly for a country like Britain ; surely, too, it is in direct opposition to the noble principle of the ' offensive ' and the great object of ' victory by battle,' about which we hear so much. His argument that economic pressure will, in the end, force an enemy to seek action even if he has an inferior fleet is not borne out by war experience ; while his strategical conception that ' the Admiral informed of his opponent's position may be enabled to place his fleet between the enemy and his line of retreat, and with his slower fleet force action on an opponent anxious to avoid a decision,' seems to assume that our enemy's commanders will always be half-wits. When we come to cruisers we find the same contempt for the speed of the enemy : ' the speed of the cruisers must be fixed with reference to our own battle fleet and not to the speed of foreign cruisers.' The latter, therefore, will be free to keep out of harm's way whenever they wish, or concentrate and attack if they should find a favourable opportunity ; surely this is unduly handicapping the British ships in their duties.

If we come to analyse the reason for such extraordinary deficiencies in these proposed ships, we find that they are due to their designer's obsession for small tonnage and British coal, as opposed to foreign oil fuel. Ships of small tonnage have the advantage that they are cheap, or that we can have more of them for the same money. The theoretical strategist likes the idea of numbers because he is thinking in terms of units and maps. The theoretical tactician likes numbers because he is visualising his black and white slugs ; but in the day of battle the Admiral will be mainly concerned with fire effect, and for that, as has been shown, each one of his ships must have a certain minimum number of guns of a size not inferior to those of the enemy, and mounted so that they can be fired with the greatest effect ; likewise, his fleet must have the speed at least to hold, and preferably to overtake, a reluctant enemy. These elementary tactical requirements apply both to battleships and cruisers ; they can only be provided in vessels of a certain size—in fact, on a displacement considerably greater than Captain Acworth's 12,000 tons. To these essentials must be added, in the case of the battleship, stout armour and under-water

protection.* In the case of the cruiser, armour must generally be sacrificed to speed; for instance, it would have been quite impracticable to have given the 10,000 ton cruisers armour which would keep out the 8-inch shells fired by foreign ships of their own class; inadequate armour is merely waste of weight; therefore, only the vital centres are armoured.

Now as to this thorny question of coal and oil: Captain Acworth in his patriotic endeavours to make out a strong case for reversion to the British fuel has neglected to give consideration to naval needs, not only in ship design, but in the employment of the fleet in time of war. Had he done so he would have realised that oil fulfils these needs while coal does not. His conception of a coal-burning fleet keeping the sea 'at very slow speed . . . for extended periods running perhaps into months' is some entirely new theory of naval strategy. What possible object can there be in keeping a fleet meandering about the ocean, wearing out its personnel and its propelling machinery, only to find when the psychological moment comes it is short of fuel and must return to harbour—to coal! Coal is not only inferior to oil in warships from the point of view of maximum speed, it is inferior as a fuel for maintaining speed, for varying speed economically, for raising steam and getting to sea quickly, for keeping boilers clean and ready for use, and for remaining at sea for as long as possible or with as short intervals as possible. A coal fleet is at a definite disadvantage as compared with an oil fleet, because on returning to harbour its efficiency is lowered by the wearisome operation of replenishing the bunkers, an operation calling for the most strenuous exertions of the personnel amongst indescribable discomfort, while the crews of the oil fleet are resting. Coal means that either armament or armour must be sacrificed to provide additional space for fuel and a larger engine-room complement, or, alternatively, the displacement must be increased and speed sacrificed. These are only a few of the very practical objections to coal in a modern fleet, but they will serve to show that if we were to revert to

* The need for sizeable battleships as the backbone of our sea security was dealt with in the article entitled, 'The Predominant Surface Ship,' in the 'Quarterly Review' of April 1930.

that fuel we should at once handicap our Navy severely as compared with the oil burning navies of foreign Powers. As the Engineer-in-Chief put it recently, 'we might just as well go back to black powder for our guns.' The extraction of oil from our native coal has long been scientifically possible; it remains to be seen whether it will become commercially practicable; but even if it does, our output cannot be sufficient and we shall be no more able to dispense entirely with foreign oil than we are now or ever likely to be able to do without foreign food.

The Locarno Pact, the increasing use of imported oil for commercial and domestic purposes, as well as for the Services, the ever-growing economic interdependence of the nations, all add to the responsibilities of our Navy. We cannot expect to find a solution to our naval problems either in Admiral Richmond's lilliputian fleets or Captain Acworth's pre-Fisher designs. Very great efforts have been made by the sea Powers to reduce expenditure by limiting both the size and number of ships. No Power has contributed so much to those efforts as Britain; but as matters stand we can make no further sacrifices in either the number or the size of our ships unless, in 1935, other nations are prepared to reduce their navies proportionately. Even so, there must be a limit to our reductions, because our *absolute* requirements in numbers of ships are dictated by the length of the trade routes we have to guard, and the ships that guard those routes must be supported by a battle fleet—the backbone to our whole system of sea security. The design of our battleships is to a large extent governed by our *relative* needs, but below a certain size and power a ship ceases to contribute to the security which it is vital that our battle fleet should provide.

With one sentiment in Captain Acworth's book every patriotic Englishman will find himself in full accord. 'Sea power as strong, chivalrous and yet relentless in war as it is gentle, hospitable and friendly in peace, remains,' he says, 'the key to England's security, to her authority in the counsels of the nations, and to the beneficence of her mission in this distraught and weary modernist world.' That sea power will not, however, be retained by a navy designed on medieval

or even eighteenth-century lines. It is a modernist world, and we cannot afford to have a cheap and simple navy while other countries have ships as powerful and as efficient as science can make them, together with every auxiliary which may aid them in the day of battle. Guns, armour, speed, aircraft and submarines, under-water weapons and their antidotes, they are all part of the armoury of man to-day. When the millennium comes and there are no racial divisions, and no conflicts of interest, then we may safely disarm ; but until then let us trust in the sure shield of a navy whose ships are second to none in their fighting equipment. We have not merely 'good,' but the best men ; it is their due that we should provide them with the best weapons.

Art. 2.—THE BIBLE IN SCOTLAND.

A Syllabus of Religious Instruction for use in Scottish Schools, approved by and issued by authority of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and the Educational Institute of Scotland. Edinburgh.

LATE last year a report came out from Scotland, that the Old Testament had been banned from the elementary schools of Glasgow. The report was incredible and is not true. The exact contrary is the case. The Bible is now, for a further period of thirteen years, as firmly entrenched in the schools of Scotland as it was in the days of John Knox ; and it is the same Bible, untouched by ancient heresy or modern criticism. A Syllabus of religious instruction for use in the Scottish schools, prepared by a Joint Committee of divines and laymen, has just been issued by the General Assembly and the Educational Institute. The syllabus is not a summary of doctrine like the Shorter Catechism. It merely suggests the order in which the Bible should be read, to correspond with the capacity of the growing child to receive the truth. That is the sole origin of the rumour. The little book of seventy-two pages is issued publicly, and may be bought in authorised places at the price of one shilling.

The title, Syllabus, possibly leaves something to be desired. The term is commonly reserved for a tabulation of matters settled by the Roman Curia, and more technically applied to that part of the Encyclical issued by Pius IX on Dec. 8, 1864, in which modern errors are set forth under ten heads. The familiar scholastic term, curriculum, a race to be run, would more closely define the contents of this book which specifies truth and not error. There is no intention to institute a comparison between these two bodies ; but the competence of the Committee must be made manifest. It was composed of eleven divines from the Church of Scotland, a cautiously equal number of laymen from the Educational Institute, and twenty members co-opted for special services, with two joint conveners and two joint secretaries ; thirteen women were included, forty-two persons in all. They were divided into various panels ; their deliberation lasted two years ; the result is approved and issued by the Church

of Scotland which, it seems, now includes the United Free Church, which was obviously a union of pre-existing bodies. The Syllabus specifies in minute detail the routine of reading and study for the two years of infancy, for junior, and senior scholastic life ; and the course naturally becomes more elaborate in each successive year of advanced and secondary education. This period of time, thirteen years, is none too long for the solemn and laborious task, especially when it is remembered that a child between the age of five and eighteen is compelled to devote some time to the secular subjects considered to be of importance in the modern school. Indeed, consecrated divines and professed theologians have gone to their graves, leaving this major task unfinished.

Contrary to the rumour propagated with a certain worldly glee, it is designed that the eighteen-year-old scribe who emerges from the Scottish school, having diligently followed this guide, turning his eyes neither to the right hand nor to the left, will have attained to a fixed belief that the Word of God, the only rule, is contained in the scriptures alone ; that the Bible is inerrant and infallible, the received text the result of a divine command to take the pen and write, *impulsus ad scribendum* ; that there was a revelation of that which was to be written, *suggestio rerum*, and of the words in which the divine doctrine was to be formulated, *suggestio verborum*. The Syllabists are careful not to disturb this ancient position, and skilfully refrain from admitting that the position has ever been assailed, although in one or two places they come upon dangerous ground in their historical annotations. It was a somewhat imprudent venture into criticism making the gratuitous supposition that the young man in the Garden, who fled away naked, was Mark. The child may be led to suspect that the second gospel was not written by a personal disciple of Jesus ; and a similar suspicion might fall upon Luke as well. Again, they quite definitely affirm that two Isaiahs were concerned in writing the book which bears the single name, and they omit the epistle to the Hebrews from the list of Paul's writings, although they include thirteen others that bear his name. They go too far, and do not go far enough.

The Bible is now a text-book in the Scottish schools, like a text-book of mathematics. The fear is that the

Scottish boy will bring to bear upon it the weapon of his Scottish intelligence, his human reason. If he were to discover a single flaw in his Euclid, the whole fabric of geometry would come to the ground. A misplaced letter will vitiate any proposition. But he will have teachers at hand to explain that Euclidean geometry is based upon certain assumptions: for example, parallel lines never meet. He will be further informed that there is a plane, a solid, and a spherical geometry; and even two further geometries depending upon the respective assumptions, that parallel lines may converge or diverge. But in respect of this divine revelation which is more complicated than any other book, he is offered no guidance, advice, or interpretation; and few Scottish schoolmasters are competent to guide the anxious inquirer through this heavenly geometry. Protestantism, which began as a protest, ended as a religion. It was soon discovered that protest, negation and denial were not an adequate basis. The tradition, practice, and teaching of the Catholic Church having been rejected, an alternative authority must be secured. That authority was sought in the Bible, which is even yet an elaborate and difficult book for unlearned minds. As a result, there were soon as many religions as readers; but in time these readers grouped themselves into a series of sects with a corresponding number of churches. The mind of the protestant child, and of many protestant adults, was bewildered. They finally fell back upon the authority of the particular church in which they were born; and the situation was precisely the same as it was before the great protest. But in the far background was the Bible to which all had the prescriptive right to appeal.

By a gradual apotheosis, this book developed from an ideal to an oracle, to a complete and final revelation of the divine mind, written, if not by God himself, at his dictation; every word his word, the hand of the scribe a mere mechanical mechanism. It was the word of God. The process went further. The book was identified with God himself; for it is written in that portion which is the easiest and earliest given to every child to read, In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. That was a heavy burden to lay upon the childish intelligence; and there are few

persons, so instructed, who do not remember their torment whilst they were learning, unaided, the distinction between the written and the living word. The case must not be over-stated, nor undue alarm felt. It does not appear to what extent the Syllabus is compulsory, nor the value assigned in terms of marks at the scholastic examinations. Scholars have a skill in evasion. A course prescribed will fall into desuetude unless it is fortified by a percentage of arithmetical marks. And even at an examination upon the scriptures, a boy need not disclose his doubts or convictions. He will draw his map of Palestine, trace the itinerary of Paul, or write the Lord's Prayer in Latin with perfect neutrality. Boys have their own reticence. By good-will and good manners, if not from the desire to stand well, they will refrain from offending against the code of the school, especially if the head master is in holy orders.

Religious education in schools may be of inestimable value, provided it is carried on by one who, in addition to a familiarity with the written word, has experience of the living word as well. It has some value even when performed by one who merely wears the garb and has the formal approval of an ordered religion. It has no value when the ministrant has none of these sanctions, and repeats the exercise as a prescribed task. Divine service is inseparable from the person conducting the service, and the wonder is that the Church of Scotland should abdicate her place and transfer an ecclesiastical function to persons of whose qualifications she has no assurance, whose conduct she is unable to control. Even when no comment upon the text is permitted, an unsympathetic or hostile teacher can by smile or sneer convey his sense of unbelief. It is not given to us to appraise the religious tenets of the masters whom the inhabitants of the Clydebank appoint to their schools, unless indeed we may judge by the speech of some of those whom they elect to the House of Commons. Parents who send their children to church schools know what they are doing, and what to expect. The drift of practice all over the world is to forbid all religious teaching in secular schools, on the ground that a Godless school is better than a school in which controversial conceptions of God are instilled.

The Committee has proceeded with a cautious discretion.

From the syllabus for infants, such 'stories' as the Fall, the Flood, Abraham and Isaac, have been properly left out. They felt, and many will agree, that these lessons might well be left to a later stage. It was this decision that gave rise to the report that the Bible had been banned from the schools. The intention of the Committee was 'to make explicit in the child's consciousness the religious conceptions gained in the early years spent in the family circle, where the idea of God comes to the infant through a parent's love and care.' But even in Glasgow there must be many wretched children who are denied this experience and inference. On the other hand, a precocious Scottish child who wanders into the Bible unguided by the syllabus, may experience a reverse process, and ascribe to his earthly father qualities implicit only in the Hebrew god. Many a child who had spelled out the text of Abraham and Isaac, and discovered that the proposed murder was an act of faith by a righteous man, approved in the sacred text, would look upon his own father askance, to observe if he too had not the fire and a knife in his hand, to slay his own son. The Committee makes no mistake in allowing an infant, five years old, to read the creation of the world, in the first and second chapters of Genesis. A child so young is not likely to discover that he has been reading two separate and contradictory accounts—nor probably the teacher either.

The Syllabus does not end with historical fact and intellectual conceptions. It attempts to create a vast background of material to illustrate the finest details of Palestinian life. Complete references are given for the description of the house, the foundations, walls, and roof; grinding the corn, mixing the dough, heating the oven; life in the village, at school, at church, in the fields, minding sheep and mending clothes; the signs of the weather; the conduct of animals, the dove, pigeon, eagle, raven, sparrow, hen and chicken, ox, camel, foxes. But it goes further. It prescribes a ritual of daily worship in the schools, with praise in psalm or hymn, responsive lessons, prayer and doxology. There are services for special occasions, prayer for the League of Nations, as if God had committed himself in advance to sanction the covenants of a body, the sum or average of whose religious belief falls so far short of that which

prevails in Scotland. The Bureau of the Assembly, on the second day of their meeting in 1920, as their earliest official act, went formally to lay a wreath on the grave of J.-J. Rousseau in Geneva.

Public worship and private worship are inseparable. When the one decays, the other soon perishes. And public worship must be conducted with good order and solemnity. That was the injunction of Paul in his fourth letter—the second, as it is commonly known—to the Corinthians who allowed that early church to fall into a state of deplorable disorder. According to the parliamentary Report for 1930, it appears that in Scotland there are 3721 schools, with 27,251 teachers, of whom 6886 are men and 20,365 women, instructing 819,539 scholars. Although we are not informed by the Syllabus whether it is entirely compulsory or if a measure of local option is permitted, assigning to these 27,251 teachers, untested and uncontrolled, the religious instruction and public worship of 819,539 scholars is too thorough an abandonment of religion to the secular arm. If as a result of the religious exercises prescribed, a revival of religion were to break out in the schools, the situation must be intolerable. The established Church or the civil authorities would be compelled to intervene. The Reformation would then be of none effect.

The sincere desire of the Committee is to temper the bleak wind that blows from the arid heights of Jerusalem to the growing child, until he is brave enough to bear the full brunt. The Church of England child has a first line of defence in the Prayer Book, rich and strong, with lessons, collects and prayers. Catholic children are more carefully protected against profound reflections. They are not encouraged, even if they are not forbidden, to read the Bible. They see the book through the veil of worship, and do not inquire too closely into the contents; but under this new scheme, the child of the Church of Scotland is condemned to pass thirteen years upon the raw text in a sordid secular school, devoid of hallowed memories and probably replete with painful ones. In such an atmosphere, it is extremely doubtful that the 'earnest hope and sincere belief' of the Committee will be fulfilled, that such a course will 'secure for the children a wealth of spiritual teaching by which life and character

may be enriched.' Jesus expressed a similar doubt to the Pharisees. They searched the scriptures, thinking to find in them eternal life ; but they would not come unto him. For Christianity is something more than a series of intellectual conceptions ; it is a practice by which men strive to discover and conform with the will of God. It provides a sanctuary for worship. It was in the sanctuary the Hebrew psalmist 'understood' that it was well for him to draw near to God. And for a receptive mind that sanctuary may be in a Highland 'meeting-house,' in a white-washed church in Holland, where one understands not a word ; or at the other extreme in Rome, when the Papal Mass is being sung, the silver trumpets heard, and the gospel read in Greek, where even the sub-deacon is a cardinal. By no device can a sanctuary be created in a secular school.

The Syllabus opens with too portentous insistence 'that religious instruction should be based on sound educational principles.' Attention is too firmly fixed upon the five-year-old infant intelligence, without considering the development that normally takes place in the Scottish mind in the ensuing thirteen years. There is the extreme possibility that a young Scotsman of genius, left to the text alone, unguided and not misled by teachers or tradition, might arrive at the truth for himself, as Newton discovered the method of fluxions, and pierced to the heart of the Descartes geometry before he was twenty-three years old. But such cases must be rare even in Scotland. The average boy will be left unmoved or bewildered. The Bible in the sixteenth century was suddenly brought out from the armoury of Geneva, as the sole weapon against Rome. This powerful weapon is now forced into the hands of nearly a million Scottish children, with entire freedom in later years to employ it against their own protestantism, and in turn against Christianity as a whole, in spite of the precaution of the syllabists. They postpone the 'story' of the Fall 'to a later stage' ; and yet at some stage the child must discover that in it lies the foundation of the whole Pauline theology, a covenant which governs the status of all subsequent mankind, and specifically brings every child born into the Church of Scotland under the divine wrath and curse, liable to all miseries in this life, to death itself,

and to the pains of hell for ever. They may well claim the right to scrutinise so important a document which is now forced upon their attention, as an exact translation of the text which Paul had before him on a Hebrew scrap of paper. If Paul, this young logician will conclude, was inadequately informed about the first Adam, he might consequently be wanting in his conception of the second Adam—Christ.

In the beginning, by way of guidance, the syllabists might have informed the child of certain simple things. They need not be called truths, lest his natural contumacy be aroused. They might be defined as axioms, a word familiar to him from his geometry book; he will accept them in a spirit of neutrality, not yet aware that there are various geometries based upon contrary axioms. He may be trusted to believe on the authority of his instructor, provisionally at least: that Jesus did not write the gospels; that neither he nor his disciples spoke English; that all the gospels are presented not as absolute but according to the varying conceptions of four separate writers whose names they bear; that two of the gospels are merely under names identical with those borne by two of the disciples, but that Luke and Mark were heathens who had never walked with Jesus, and wrote in Greek long after the occurrence of the events they record.

It might 'be left to a later stage' to supplement this list by the writers of the Pauline and other epistles, the Acts, and the Apocalypse; continually insisting that all performed a work of writing, the most important that ever came from human hands; and did it with a naive artlessness concealing a skill that it has ever since been the despair of subsequent writers to imitate. They clothed the person of Jesus with garments of their own device; they were so concerned with their task of adorning him, that they left his figure concealed but intact for our perfect recognition when all the trappings are stripped away. It should be made clear, also, that they wrote as opponents, the one of the other; the liberal-minded Luke, of the Jewish Matthew; the fanatic Apocalypsist, of the apostate Paul; the great conciliator in Acts, striving to reconcile Peter the apostle of the Jews with Paul the apostle of the Gentile, and so erect the twin towers upon which still rests the Christian Church.

For the scholar, after he has emerged into the world, even if he is designed for the ministry, will begin to reflect upon a process of reading which has lasted for thirteen years, even if he has not yet reflected whilst the reading was in progress. He may fortify himself by a study of all the books mentioned in the appended bibliography, 141 in number ; but he will soon discover that this formidable library is partial and exclusive. He will have heard of Locke, Hume, and Hobbes, but will dismiss them as reputed atheists ; Bellarmin, Simon, Semler, Leclerc, Renan, Loisy, but they were Jesuits or some other kind of Catholics ; Spinoza, Reinach, Jews ; Schleiermacher, the most puzzling of all. Upon his dawning horizon a cloud of new witnesses will arise : Matthew Arnold, himself a school-inspector ; every writer in modern dictionaries and encyclopedias ; translations from German and Dutch writers, men of protestant learning and piety in spite of their language and race. The ' Bible for Young People,' by Oort, Hooykaas, and Kuenen may be had from the Sunday School Association ; and the writings of Auguste Sabatier are accessible in any public library. At this point, Martin Luther and John Calvin, most authentic protestants, may rise from the dead, to confront the bewildered boy : Luther declaring that the epistle of James is a veritable epistle of straw ; Calvin doubting the authenticity of the second epistle of Peter, and describing the discrepancies in the gospel narratives.

This logical boy has now an easy step to the conclusion, that the *textus acceptus* placed in his hands by the authors of the Syllabus is merely one of many publications, comparable with that received in the seventeenth century from the Elzevirs, a Dutch firm of booksellers. But, happily, out of all this mental confusion, the living person of the essential Jesus may leap into life ; and henceforth the boy live in peace, but with a certain bitterness against those who had entombed that person in a book, and with a fixed resolve that his own children shall not be enslaved and tormented before they are set free. There are too many old men yet living who cannot forget their own early years of torment, pretending like Tertullian to believe a thing, *certum quia impossibile est* ; falling between the antithesis of Anselm, *intelligere ut credam : credo ut intelligam*, understanding to believe, or believing

to understand. These are they from whom those are drawn, who have silently abandoned the church, and will not allow the Bible in the hands of their children. They yield a further class, more ignoble and less reticent, from which the village atheist is drawn, the too familiar figure who makes a nuisance of himself in every Scottish public-house where points of religion are being discussed.

Criticism of this Syllabus must go deeper still. The scheme declares itself to be 'Christo-centric,' a new mechanical term, adopted from the jargon of modern mechanics. It explains Christ as the Jewish Messiah, the central theme of scripture. It mis-translates Messiah as 'Sent from God.' Jesus is the Christ. Things equal to the same thing are equal to one another. Jesus is the Jewish Messiah. One who is not a scholar will hesitate to correct these divines on a question of scholarship; but one who has skill enough to read a dictionary will discover that 'Messiah' merely means the 'anointed One,' and that 'Christ' is the exact rendering in Greek. The Syllabus does not make it sufficiently clear to the young scholar, that the Jewish Messiah, the Calvinist Christ, and Jesus of Nazareth are quite different persons. Indeed, he will fail to find many points of resemblance between them. For the Protestant Christ is not the Jewish Messiah, the Greek Logos, nor yet the essential Jesus of the gospels. He is the final achievement of the Calvinistic mind, a subtle blend of French logic, German realism, Greek speculation, Roman legalism, and Jewish zeal. Still less was Jesus the Messiah expected by the Jews, coming upon the clouds, to establish in Jerusalem an earthly kingdom come down from heaven, wherein the Jews would have the heathen so completely at their mercy, that they could take up their little children, and dash them against the cobble-stones of the street. Clearly apart from this earthly Messiah, from this intellectual Christ, from the Christ of the Church of England, so delicately poised between Rome and Geneva, is the Infant Jesus naturally subordinate to the Mother. Indeed, in some places, Lisbon and Naples, one may live for a month and never hear the name of Jesus mentioned, save in the mouth of an American tourist who feels himself aggrieved by the customs of the country. To separate, trace, and distinguish the elements in these varying conceptions is the

peculiar task of modern theological scholarship. That task is nearly accomplished, and the essential Jesus is beginning to emerge from the Jewish predilection and Greek speculation in which he has too long been entombed. And the truth is beginning to dawn, that he is the most important person who ever appeared upon earth ; compared with him, military conquerors negligible, Socrates a dialectical trifle, Plato a tasteless blend of subtlety and nonsense. Even in metaphysics he excels them. He is presented to the Scottish boy on quite other grounds. The Syllabus is another stone placed at the mouth of the tomb.

This scriptural scholar on leaving school will have much to unlearn about Gentiles and Pharisees alike. He had not suspected from Paul's catalogue of heathen vices, that they were capable of books and art still considered admirable. The Pharisees are the most maligned men in history. The accounts of their conduct come from heathen sources, and they were written after Jerusalem had fallen, when none were left to defend or contradict. It was then safe to pronounce woes against them. Jesus learned and taught in their synagogues. He had no objection to the observance of their ritual, so long as it did not blind them to the inner light. Nor did he object to sacrifice ; he merely insisted that the act should not obscure or defeat the deeper law. He yearned over Jerusalem ; he would have gathered her children, and brooded over them. The Jewish church kept alive and pure the faint stream of truth that emanated from Sinai, guiding it through a savage wilderness, until it emerged in Jesus for the healing of all nations. For Jesus never pretended that he was creating a new religion ; he merely seized upon the old religion which, as the tendency of all religions is, had become formal, outworn, and material ; he strove to elevate that religion and project it into the spiritual life, so that the real intent of it might be fulfilled. If he appeared to them indifferent and finally hostile, it was because his mission was not to the righteous but to those who had the greater need ; to sinners, and not alone to technical sinners, that is, persons such as tax-collectors, who for formal cause had been expelled from the synagogues, but to sinners against the moral law. It was left to Paul to extend the term ' sinners '

to all mankind, and bring us within the compass of the gospel. Even the order of service in the synagogue is yet so closely observed in the Church of Scotland, as continually witnessed by the present writer, although probably altered in the intervening years, that a Jewish Pharisee would find himself quite at home. He would see the men on one side, the women on the other with covered heads, as Paul enjoins, lest the evil spirits might become entangled in their hair—it was in those days a shame for a woman to be shorn; he might even hear a bell ring, to drive those evil spirits off the premises. He would hear one elder read from the law, another from the prophets, a third, or a minister if present, make an exposition of what had been read; he would hear one of his own psalms sung, a long prayer delivered to the worshippers in a standing posture—a prayer which Jesus himself felt was too long, when he furnished his disciples with a model of the manner in which to pray.

There are wide lapses, too, in the Syllabus. The young sinner will look in vain for any guidance towards everlasting punishment for sin; but this vague silence alone will not be enough to dispel from youthful minds the knell of doom, thrice reiterated by Mark as coming from Jesus, to a place where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. As men, and therefore God, became less cruel, the situation of the wicked improved. The living might be baptized for the dead; and when Jesus descended into hell for three days, he could not have been idle. An intermediate place was next prepared. Under St Augustine, it developed into a purgatory which was finally approved by a dogma of Gregory; but it had the fatal defect that the purifying flames were not salutary for all, but only for those who were ultimately destined for heaven. Had the process of purification been universal, purgatory would have been a place which any reasonable man might accept. He is not good enough for heaven, nor bad enough for hell; and his time in purgatory, which for a very good man was estimated at five thousand years, is in reality very short compared with eternity. But this amelioration was suddenly arrested in the sixteenth century by the Protestant Reformation, when hell itself was reformed for the worse, and made an eternal instrument of divine vengeance. It appears,

however, to have been reserved exclusively for Catholics, as the hell Dante saw contained, with the exception of certain historical characters who could not well be excluded, none but Italians, most of whom were his own political enemies. Professor Woodhead suggests that all countries had hellish arrangements for their own nationals.

It is certain that every intelligent boy, either in school or out of school, must come face to face with the problem of the miraculous. The Jewish Messiah was to be accompanied by great wonders and miracles. There were to be specific signs to herald his advent—an earthquake, the sun black as sackcloth, the moon red as blood, the stars falling to earth, hail and fire mingled with blood, a third part of the sea become blood. The devil and his angels were to be cast out of heaven upon the earth, and thence cast alive into a bottomless pit burning with fire and brimstone, bound with a great chain for a thousand years. Those of us who have had the misfortune to be born non-Jews may read in the Apocalypse of the fate in store for us in this heavenly kingdom. Luke is more moderate. He looked merely for earthquakes, famine, pestilence, the sea and the waves roaring; and these things were to happen before his own generation had passed away. Compared with these high portents, the humble miracles ascribed to Jesus were not convincing to the Pharisees. They were sincerely anxious to know if he were this Messiah. They came to him, asking quite reasonably to be shown his authority, demanding a sign. He had no such miracles to offer. They could, he said, discern the weather on the face of the sky; they could not discern the signs of his ministry before their eyes, the same sign as the prophet Jonah displayed when, as a result of his warning, the people of Nineveh turned every one from their evil way. Again, when Jesus was made to appear before Herod, Herod was exceeding glad, for he hoped to have seen some miracle done by him; but Jesus answered him nothing, and performed no miracle. Then Herod set him at nought and mocked him in saturnalian glee. He arrayed him in the gorgeous robe of the Jewish Messiah. That has ever since been the real mockery of Jesus.

When the Baptist was in prison, as all three synoptic

gospels record, he sent two of his disciples to ask Jesus if he was this calculated Messiah. Apparently he had forgotten, or was unconvinced by, the sign and voice experienced at the baptism. Go and show John, Jesus said, as his final message, that the poor have the gospel preached to them. In his native place where he was best known, he performed no mighty works. He told his disciples that a peculiarly obstinate devil could be cast out by no other miracle than prayer. In later years, the evangelists met the protests of unbelievers by saying that the miracles were performed in secret. To the leper that was healed, to the blind man of Bethsaida, Jesus commanded that they were to tell no man. The woman who had in vain spent all her living upon physicians, and was healed by a mere touch upon his garment, was told that it was her own faith that cured her. The Pharisee's daughter was raised to life only after all witnesses had been excluded, and they were charged that they should not tell. Doubts that he was the Jewish Messiah were similarly set at rest. When Peter admitted that he was the Christ, he charged his disciples that they should tell no man; and even the witnesses of the transfiguration were forbidden to mention the matter during his lifetime. In this atmosphere of secrecy, it is easy to understand how the gospel of miracles arose. In those days, miracles were the final evidence, the equipment of every claimant for divine power; of magicians, witches, necromancers, sorcerers, exorcists. The Egyptians beat Aaron at his own game. The disciples came to Jesus complaining of one who was casting out devils in his name. As the seven sons of Sceva, in Paul's time, were exorcising an evil spirit, the man leaped upon them so that they fled naked and wounded. We have gone to the other extreme. If we saw a man offering a miracle as proof of his teaching, we should brand him as an impostor. The supreme miracle of Jesus was not turning water into wine, but converting evil into good.

By this continual reading of the Bible, the young scholar may come to look upon it as an English book, written in the hard literalness of the English. In reality, it is an Oriental book, written in terms of picture, allegory, parable, miracle. That was the language in which Jesus spoke to his disciples, who were ignorant and unlearned

men; and even in the mind of Jesus parable passed insensibly into miracle. He justified the father of the prodigal son on the ground that he who had been dead was raised to life again. Death to him, as to Paul, was dead in trespasses and in sin; the deaf were those who had ears but could not hear; the palsied those who could not follow him; the blind those who could not see the light that emanated from his person. These were they whom he had come to heal. But there is a larger category of miracles ascribed to Jesus by the evangelists, which fall under two heads according as they wish to refute or enforce the respective doctrines, that the mission of Jesus was to the Jews alone or to the heathen as well; and there is in addition a small series which suggests a compromise between these extreme opinions. But in every case, the miracles convey the finest shades of meaning. The problem facing many thoughtful parents is, How much or how little of the miraculous shall they teach to their children? They need not be perplexed unduly. Children in these days know more than they pretend not to know. A wise parent will 'feel' with the syllabists that such 'stories'—corrected in the next line to 'lessons'—as 'Abraham and Isaac, may well be left to a later stage.' He may feel, further, that the stories or lessons of the miracles literally and without their meaning might be included in the same category. Many a parent will evade a decision about the arrival of that stage, and in the end do nothing, lest his children may come to think that he has sophisticated the truth.

Why then, the child may ask, did the evangelists deceive us? They did not deceive us. We deceived ourselves. They wrote for a purpose in terms which their readers could understand. If they had surmised that a time should ever come when men would be so stupid that they could not understand, they would have ascribed our stupidity, as they ascribed the refusal of the Jews to hear the spoken words of Jesus, to a specific hardening of the heart, as occurred also in the case of Pharaoh, so that the divine purpose might be fulfilled. Having admitted that this assumed plenary inspiration ceased nearly two thousand years ago, the scholar might be left to infer that all mankind, being left in that freedom of will originally conferred upon them, developed a further insight

into their spiritual life, as they developed a new way of looking upon the external world of nature around them, with the result that the modern Scottish boy differs in thought, word, and deed from the boy brought up in the schools of Jerusalem or Alexandria. It could even be affirmed with truth, that it was this Jesus of Nazareth who first opened our eyes, and revealed the mystery of eternal life; and that we can see him more clearly than he was seen by those who saw him in the flesh.

Every religion has had 'sacred things,' which were not to be exposed to vulgar view or the touch of profane hands. That well-meaning man who put forth his hand to prevent the sanctuary from falling off the ox-cart was stricken dead. The sacred thing of Christianity is the Resurrection of Jesus. The child who is taught to comprehend that miracle will understand all others. It is so easy of comprehension that every member of the Episcopal Church, which is the most vital protestant church in America, has a complete understanding of the miraculous. Under the frank direction of their clergy, they have arrived at a finality of opinion by reading the text, and that is the only source of knowledge. No child who goes out from that Church has anything to unlearn, and henceforth for them Jesus is proof against the utmost that criticism, science, or human reason in any other form can effect. A scientific man may then be as religious as he likes, and no aspersion cast upon his science; a religious man may be as scientific as he likes, and no aspersion cast upon his religion.

We take leave to doubt if all the lay members of the Committee have read and compared the various accounts of that great central event, the Resurrection of Jesus, in the text which they propose to place in the hands of children. We invite them to examine the record anew. There were over five hundred eye-witnesses; but in the minds of all, whose opinions are recorded, there was a singular unanimity of unbelief in a physical appearance. None of these witnesses—save one, Paul—have left to us any account of their experience; but there remains to us this most important witness, because thrice in public speech and once in writing under his own hand, he leaves a permanent record. He is the first and only eye-witness to give a written account of the risen Jesus. He specifies

the order of the appearances: (1 Cor. xv, 5) first to Peter; then to the twelve apostles; then to more than five hundred of the brethren at once, the greater part of whom were yet alive; after that, he was seen of James, then of all the apostles; and last of all he was seen by Paul himself, who gives us a detailed account, or rather four separate accounts which do not differ much the one from the other. In the first (Acts ix, 3) we are told that as he journeyed from Jerusalem to Damascus, a light shone round about him; he fell to the earth; he heard a voice. The men who were with him stood speechless, hearing a voice but seeing no man. In the second account (Acts xxii, 6), suddenly at noon he saw a light; he fell to the ground; he heard a voice; they that were with him saw the light, but heard no voice. In the last account (Acts xxvi, 13), he saw a light at midday shining round about him and them that journeyed with him. All fell to the earth; he alone heard a voice. The one circumstance common to all three is that he saw no one, and he provides us with an answer to his own inquiry (1 Cor. ix, 1), have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? It is fair to assume that the appearance of Jesus to the other witnesses whom Paul mentions was not any more material.

These new mathematico-physicists, who have taken upon themselves the conjoined office of scientist, philosopher, and theologian, are now conveying to us precisely the same warning which Jesus delivered to the Jews, that God is not concrete but the principle of concreteness; but it is a law of the human mind that the concrete grows at the expense of the spirit, the material in place of the meaning. The inner voice which Paul heard soon took on a bodily form; but the series and sequence of witnesses to that form as given in the gospels differs widely from his and from one another. When Jesus died, the disciples fled home to Galilee. According to Mark, his first appearance was to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. When she told them that had been with him, that he had been seen of her, they did not believe her. After that, he appeared in another form unto two of his friends as they walked in the country. They told it to the residue, but they in turn did not believe it. Afterwards he appeared to the eleven as they sat at

meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart because they did not believe what they had been told (Mark xvi, 14). According to Matthew (xxviii, 9) the first appearance was to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. He appeared once more to the eleven disciples in Galilee; but some of them doubted. According to Luke, it was to Cleophas and a friend he appeared as they walked from Jerusalem. At first they did not recognise him, and as soon as they knew him, he vanished out of their sight. The two returned, and as they were telling a company in which were the eleven disciples, Jesus stood in the midst of them. They were terrified, and supposed they had seen a spirit. The narrative after fifty years becomes concrete, to combat the docetic heresy. Jesus bade them handle him, to convince themselves that, unlike a spirit, he had flesh and bones. Even yet, all did not believe. Why then should a greater burden of faith be laid upon the modern child?

To the Jews belief in the resurrection of the body was easy. Their eschatology, doctrine of the last things, the situation after death, was simpler than ours. The body was placed in a grave, where it was observed to undergo the normal process of disintegration or corruption applicable to all flesh. And yet, the resurrection of the dead was quite common. On one occasion, the graves were opened; and many bodies arose and came out of their graves, went into Jerusalem, and appeared unto many (Matt. xxvii, 52). The Corinthian convert was not alone in the reasonable inquiry, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Paul's answer, that the man was a fool, is not adequate. Still more inadequate is his explanation: That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die (1 Cor. xv, 36). The most elementary child knows very well that the seed that is to be quickened has never died. Those who conduct funerals would do well to think upon this. They might content themselves with Paul's earlier utterance: In Christ shall all be made alive. To the Jews, the ascension into the sky presented no greater difficulty. It was well known that several persons of unusual sanctity had so ascended, without passing through the grave. Paul himself knew a man only fourteen years ago, who was caught up to the third heaven and heard unspeakable

words ; but whether this man was in the body or out of the body, Paul could not tell. The evangelists, writing at a later period, are more reserved. Mark merely says that he was received up into heaven. Matthew makes no mention of the occurrence. Luke says he parted from his disciples at Bethany, and he or a later editor adds that he was carried up into heaven. John tells us nothing. The writer of Acts is more specific. He was taken up, and a cloud received him.

The trial and death of Jesus is the central spectacle of human history. No external light is shed upon it ; nothing but flashes of truth emanating from Jesus himself, which reveal him silent, dignified, confident. His disciples had fled, all but one : and he was so preoccupied in the outer court with his own safety that he heard or saw nothing. The resolve that the scriptures be fulfilled governs the finest details of the narrative. The cowardice ascribed to the disciples who fled to their home in Galilee ; the infamy heaped on Judas, who was the only Judean in the group ; the careful account of Peter's poltroonery ; the obvious attempt to exculpate Pilate and place the blood of Jesus upon the Jews and their children,—all this is sure evidence that the accounts are the product of heathen minds. More still, it makes of Jesus a false witness against himself, when he is made to declare that he is the Jewish Messiah, the King of the Jews, whom they should see sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. The close resemblance of the narrative to the better-attested evidence in the subsequent record of the trial of Stephen and of Paul suggests that Jesus also was the victim of the populace, disappointed in their Messiah. He was put to death, not because he was their Messiah, but because he was not. The vulgar suggestion of worldly power was to him the voice of Satan. Even in the spiritual kingdom, in comparison with God, he would not allow himself to be called good.

It is of no importance to us that the Hebrew scriptures should be fulfilled ; it is only by a process of suggestion that any reference to Jesus can be found in them. It is of great importance to us that he was not the Jewish Messiah. We should have no part in his kingdom, unless indeed Mr W. G. MacKendrick is right in his theorem that the people of Scotland are one of the lost tribes of

Israel. We invite the syllabists, by a further reading of the Old Testament, to consider afresh their 'Christo-centric' theory. The Hebrew prophecies were political. They referred to Israel as a nation. Isaiah dealt with the Assyrian invasion; Jeremiah with the Babylonian captivity; Daniel with the overthrow of the Greek monarchy. Their Messiah was to be an earthly king formally 'anointed'; indeed, Cyrus the Persian was the candidate of the second Isaiah. When all hope of a Jewish national ruler was finally abandoned, the aspiration of the later prophets assumed other forms, but never fixed itself upon so unlikely a person as Jesus, who came to minister and not to be ministered unto, and had no earthly place to lay his head. He cannot have been this grotesque figment of the oriental mind. The evangelists did not even read their text with care. Matthew ascribes to Jeremiah a prophecy that comes from Zechariah. Upon a Greek mistranslation of a single word in Isaiah, the whole narrative of the virgin-birth is built. The early chronologists knew nothing of the matter. They trace the earthly parentage upward through David, although the Jewish Matthew stops short at Abraham, whilst the Gentile Luke ends with,—Adam, which was the son of God; he could not fairly be looked upon as a Jew, even if Abraham and Adam were. Paul did not flinch from the facts. Jesus died upon the cross. This cross was to him and to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks a foolishness. His supreme task was to convert that cross into a thing of glory, even at the cost of propagating the Hebrew scriptures, and establishing Jesus as a Messiah, but of quite a contrary kind.

Humanity has never been able to disinterest itself in the future state. It was Paul's sensational preaching of a skiey kingdom into which even some of those then living would be caught up alive, that won the Gentiles. The Jews, with the exception of the Sadducees, who believed neither in the resurrection, nor in spirits, nor in angels, had devised a system that was only a little more material than Paul's. The spirits of the departed, good and bad alike, went into a subterranean pit, where they lay prostrate and inanimate, and were not even allowed the privilege accorded by the Greeks, to wander and flit about within their confines. There they were to remain until

summoned back to earth by their Messiah. That was the first resurrection. When this earthly reign was over, the fabric of the universe would be dissolved, and they would appear for final judgment. That was the second resurrection; but until Paul's day no provision whatever was made for the heathen. Hence arose the bitter controversy between the early Jewish-Christians and the heathen-Christians; the Jews determined to preserve their exclusive national rights, unwilling to admit the Greeks unless they first became Jews; and the Greeks anxious to find a place on easier terms. Jesus never assented to this exclusive privilege. Even the Jews would not rise again unless they were accounted worthy. Eternal life must be sought for and seized upon. God could, if he liked, transform the very stones into Jews. To secure that entrance for the Gentiles was the supreme struggle of Paul's life. Upon the issue turned the greatest crisis in the history of civilisation. Paul turned the tide in our favour. Entrance could be had by faith alone; but faith came to mean not a revelation of the essential Jesus but a belief, enforced or pretended, in an historical figment, the joint product of Jewish pertinacity and Greek speculation. The controversy between the two parties was carried on with a ferocity only equalled fifteen centuries later, when Geneva fell into conflict with Rome.

It was in such an atmosphere the four gospels and all the New Testament were written. But, in spite of themselves, the writers left the essential Jesus in the New Testament where we can discover him for ourselves. They failed in their intention; they did not fail in the fact. Mistaken as they were in their thesis, they were not wholly mistaken about his person, and they have left to us that supreme residual gift. Indeed, had it not been for their theses in which he is enshrouded, nothing of his person would have remained to us. He would have disappeared in oriental darkness. Although they clothed him in a garb part Jewish, part Greek, part Roman, they have preserved him to us. When the mould in which he was cast is broken, his person leaps into life. This syllabus will not help the child to break that mould. It is the most studious of this scheme who will have the most to unlearn. Ignorant of modern Christianity, with no coherent knowledge of the origin or development, and

little experience of the practice, he will be indignant or hostile. He will conclude that the churches have always had a secret scepticism about their Christ, implying that he should be defended from the human reason, approached with eyes blinded by a faith, as Tertullian said, in the impossible, beseeching when they could no longer compel that his person be not regarded too closely. Jesus had not the slightest scepticism about himself. He urged his disciples to hearken and understand. With a complete understanding, they would achieve a faith in him, which in the language of the time would bring them a power comparable with that required for the removal of a mountain or walking upon the water.

When the churches clearly discern the mind of Jesus, and feel through him the power of God, they are then free to endow and adorn him with those elements of symbolism which are inseparable from public worship, with order, beauty, and splendour, even with the miraculous, according to the need and custom of those who worship, ranging all the way from the austere silence and secret ecstasy of a Quaker meeting or a Christian Science meditation, through the solemn service of the Church of Scotland, the dignified ritual of the Church of England, to the tumultuous splendour of the Christmas Mass. The visible Church is an institution, the work of men's various hands. Like all human institutions, it is governed by conventions which the members are willing to accept. Those who are content to live happily under the British monarchy are content to believe that the King is king by divine right, and that the King can do no wrong although his ministers may, and do. They leave to historians the discussion of the origin and meaning of these conventions, contenting themselves with a simple loyalty. The moment the Monarch or the Church begins to assert that those conventions are literally true, rebellion and revolution have already begun. That is the history of every Monarchy and of every Church. That is the danger in the present Syllabus. It is a dangerous book. It brings into the half-light matters that had better be left in their original obscurity, or else brought further forth into the full light of the modern mind.

ANDREW MACPHAIL.

Art. 3.—THE FUTURE OF GOLD IN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY.

THE theme of this paper is based on an inference drawn from the following propositions: (1) that there will be a decline in the production of gold within the next few years; (2) that population increases at a compound rate of one per cent. per annum; * (3) that wealth production normally increases at a compound rate of three per cent. per annum; † (4) that the economic system of the gold-standard countries taken as a whole is becoming, with the advance of civilisation, more and more inelastic and therefore more sensitive to changes in money values; and (5) that, in any case, long-run monetary stability is a condition desirable in itself; the inference being that the system under which the Gold Standard is at present operated will lend itself to a continuous, and not merely prolonged, fall in the normal price level, followed by deep-rooted changes in the distribution of wealth, a partial destruction of the economic machine, and all-round economic retrogression manifested in a falling standard of living, individually and collectively.

Before proceeding to the main arguments, it is necessary to recapitulate the fundamental difference between normal and actual price levels in order that we may appreciate the full significance of a permanent price movement. The decline of 1930, for instance, was not caused by a permanent change in the world's stock of monetary gold, nor, therefore, in the value of gold. It was brought about by a series of factors which were drawn together, to form a maelstrom of alternating causes and effects, by lack of business confidence. The downward movement of wholesale prices and the accompanying intense depression constituted an outward and visible sign of a phase in the trade cycle; and it is important to distinguish such a movement from one likely to arise from a proportionate decrease in the world's stock of monetary gold relative to the increase in the volume of marketed goods and services. On the one hand, if a rise in the value of gold is due to a downward curve of the

* Sir Henry Strakosch, 'Gold and the Price Level,' 'Economist,' July 5, 1930.

† Idem.

trade cycle, the rise is temporary, class gains and losses being offset in the subsequent revival by equal losses and gains respectively. On the other, if it is due to a relative decrease in the stock of monetary gold, the rise is permanent; and as the gap between gold production and wealth production widens, or rather tends to widen, the gains and losses accruing to the various classes will tend to increase. If the movement in either case is allowed to take its natural course, there is hope in the one and despair in the other.

In one respect, the available supply of monetary gold appears to have equal bearing on cyclical as on permanent changes. To avoid mal-distribution of the metal, whether the mal-distribution be due to permanent factors such as an existing spirit of 'mercantilism' or to temporary factors such as the apparent nationalist hoarding which is a characteristic of periods of economic instability, a universal effort would tend to straighten both cyclical and (during gold scarcity) permanent movements. But many arguments have been adduced in an attempt to place the onus of the present mal-distribution of gold on to the shoulders of those countries which hold more than a fair share per head of population; whereas the balance of evidence favours the more recently advanced theory that the abnormally large gold stocks in the United States, France and the Argentine are an effect, and not a cause, of external economic forces.

We could regard the useless parts of these holdings as a reserve on which to draw as the need for supplementing actual gold production increases; but it is certain that all available gold will find a level as a monetary basis during the forthcoming revival, since the existing normal price level, as determined by costs of production, demands as much as the available supply all told.

Economy in the use of the metal, therefore, will be no solution to the problem of its scarcity. Prudent handling by the central banks may postpone a change of system, but whether economy takes the form of a concerted effort to mobilise all available gold and thus widen the basis of currency and credit, or of a general increase in fiduciary issues, the extent to which it may be safely carried is extremely limited. The need for a

constantly increasing supply of gold cannot be met for ever ; and sooner or later, as there is or is not economy, and as there comes to light or not new gold fields, the monetary authorities of the world will be compelled to consider some means of averting what gold scarcity promises to bring with it. And with this further inference we may make some attempt to obtain a glimpse of the future trend of international monetary policy.

There is little need to emphasise the importance of the recent development of central banking co-operation ; for future progress in the economic life will depend more than ever on its continued growth. Whatever changes in monetary policy may be designed to meet gold scarcity, their inception must not, in the cause of international peace, interfere with the accumulated 'savings' of mercantilist countries. For, although such countries will become parties to concerted action, they must not be asked to relinquish their gold holdings for international central banking purposes. The number of gold money units in existence, and therefore the normal price level, depend on the size of existing stocks of monetary gold and on the customary economies effected in their use as a basis for currency and credit. There is, however, a third circumstance. The number of gold money units and the normal price level depend also on the quantity of gold for which each unit will exchange. And it seems to me that this fact will present itself to the monetary authorities of the future as the only avenue of escape from the evils which will accompany a real gold scarcity. While the world's stock of the metal depends for its maintenance and growth on the vagaries of Mother Earth and on accidental geological discoveries, and economies are limited by the dictates of safety, the quantity of gold per money unit depends on custom, policy and other human factors, over which, given the will, there is complete control.

So long as the volume of money continues to grow at a compound rate equal to the average rate of growth over, say, the past half century, legislative compulsion of fixity in the quantity of gold per money unit will continue to be sound policy. Not so, however, when the quantity of gold is insufficient to support a structure of currency and credit wide enough to maintain normal

prices on a constant level. Modern economic conditions demand that money values shall have a closer long-run affinity to commodity values than has previously existed. The monetary system that yields to such a demand cannot reasonably be accused of embodying a policy of devaluation, because logically the term involves the quantity of goods and services for which a money unit will exchange, rather than the quantity of gold upon which the unit happens to be based.* Provided currency devaluation is successfully resorted to as a means of stabilising the normal price level, the only practical (as distinct from sentimental) objections to it arise out of its effects on overseas trade—not because it would reduce exports (the contrary would probably be the effect) but because it would tend to reduce imports, thus creating a situation in which the country would for a time be unable to receive full value for exports, and in which, as a consequence, the standard of living would fall. However, I have already emphasised the need for greater international co-operation. An agreement amongst the central banks aiming at simultaneous, *pro rata*, devaluation would obviate foreign exchange fluctuations, and thus remove all objections of this nature.

The preceding paragraphs suggest systematic devaluation, which, in turn, implies a system. What that system shall be is a question providing scope for a little thoughtful, as well as imaginative, speculation. We have yet to consider, then, by what means the required measure of devaluation will be arrived at and the method of operation; and to devise a scheme which will eradicate the half-practical, half-sentimental objections suggested by the terms, 'inflation,' 'managed currency,' 'flight from the Gold Standard,' and the rest. This might easily lead one into a long dissertation on the merits and demerits of the Gold Standard; but I am assuming, and logically I believe, that for many years to come the world will require an international medium of exchange which will consist of something more substantial than paper credits, and that that medium will be gold.

* But my subsequent use of *devaluation* is in the commonly accepted sense, i.e. devaluation in terms of gold.

Systematic devaluation will have to be based on calculations previously made, that is, on a pre-measurable rate of increase, in order that the resultant addition to the total volume of money will meet, with some degree of accuracy, the computed increase in the demand for purchasing power. Since this demand may be calculated on either of two bases, viz.: Population or Wealth Production, questions of equity in the distribution of wealth are involved.

To take the computed rates of increase in (1) Population, and (2) Wealth Production furnished by Sir Henry Strakosch, we obtain, in applying them to the required purpose, the following results: (1) Population increases at a compound rate of one per cent. per annum. Therefore, taking into consideration current gold production and new economies in its use, the extent of annual devaluation in terms of gold must be determined by the additional volume of money required to yield a net increase of one per cent. per annum. The effects of this would be, *ceteris paribus*, a uniform rate of money wages and salaries; and, since production tends to outpace population, an increase in real incomes, as the outcome of a steadily declining normal price level. This method would give to holders of fixed interest-bearing securities equally with active earners the benefits of industrial progress. The declining normal price level would have a long-run restraining influence on production. (2) Normally, wealth production increases at a compound rate of three per cent. per annum. Therefore, annual devaluation, together with other factors, must yield a net increase in the volume of money of three per cent. per annum. This would ensure fixity in the normal level of prices. The tendency of costs to decline as a consequence of the increasing productivity of labour (an inference drawn from the differential margin between population and production rates of increase) would stimulate employers' demand for labour, and both real and money wages and salaries would rise proportionately. In this case, holders of fixed interest-bearing securities would fail to reap the benefits of industrial progress.

Obviously, the question underlying the choice between these methods is whether the volume of money shall grow proportionately with the number of man-hours

entering into production or with the number of units of output. Regarding it from the point of view of accuracy in measurement, there is, perhaps, more in favour of the second than the first. The rates of increase in population vary in different countries. Furthermore, the demand for money could be based logically only on the working population, that is, that proportion of the total that divides itself into employed and seeking to be employed. In view of the untrustworthy nature or entire absence of population statistics in various parts of the world, these objections are serious. But it may be argued that variations in population would be reflected in the second system also, since the rate of increase in production depends to a great extent on the rate of increase in population. In isolated cases, mainly brought about by immigration, this argument is doubtless valid, but as we are considering the welfare of the world as a whole we may reject it on the ground that, in countries where population increases rapidly, production tends to lag owing to various factors touching capital accumulation, higher proportions of child population and so forth, whereas, in countries where population increases slowly, capital accumulation tends to outpace it and, by reason of its stimulating effect on industry, to offset population deficiencies.

In any case, apart from these considerations and those affecting the distribution of wealth, it should be the aim of monetary policy to stimulate wealth production as much as possible without incurring the sort of evil reactions which often accompany prolonged upward movements of the price level. It is self-evident that the first method, lending itself, as it does, to a continuous decline in the normal price level, impedes the quest for maximum output, while the second, in taking the middle course, is conducive to maximum output in the long run. The standard of living is involved, and that, being of the first economic importance, should draw the scale in favour of the second method. The difficulties common to both are of a technical character. That the broad principles of central banking vary considerably in different countries may constitute an argument to the effect that before devaluation on the system outlined could be effectively carried out, that is, on an inter-

national *pro rata* scale, it would be necessary for all gold-standard countries to adopt a common code. Be that as it may, the only practical point of attack would be the actual note issues. Banking credit should be allowed to expand on the wider basis proportionately and in the natural course of business, in order that expansion may spread itself over a period and thus avoid sudden economic agitation. Where the fiduciary note issue is a percentage of the whole, its expansion would be automatic; but where it is a fixed number of units, powers of increasing it would have to be obtained. A simple example will make this clearer.

Let us take the case of the Bank of England. It is assumed that an increase of three per cent. in the world's volume of money is required, and this to be created entirely by currency devaluation. The Bank would reduce the quantity of gold it pays and receives for its notes by 2.9126 per cent.* This would yield a net addition of three per cent. to the note issue, which would expand from, say, 420l. m. to 432.6l. m., made up of 164.8l. m. fully backed issue (originally 160l. m.) and 267.8l. m. fiduciary issue (originally 260l. m.). Provided the banks allowed their credit liabilities to increase in the natural course of business until the original proportion to reserve was reached, the ultimate effect would be a net addition of three per cent. to the total volume of sterling currency and credit. Other central banks would take similar measures; and thus the world's total volume of money would ultimately expand by the required

* The suggestion that the percentage of devaluation in terms of gold should be so meticulously effected as to necessitate the fourth decimal place may occasion comment. It implies that the speed at which the volume of money and annual commodity production would keep pace with each other can be measured with great accuracy. There is a certain rate of growth below which, *ceteris paribus*, commodity production would tend to outpace the increase in money, and above which the increase in money would tend to outpace commodity production. The measurement of this mean rate of increase is a condition to long-run monetary stabilisation under the system outlined; for, unless the volume of money increases at the same rate as commodity production, the normal price level will either rise or fall. For the purpose of this section of the article I have adopted the normal rate of commodity production (three per cent. per annum compound) computed by Sir Henry Strakosch. Although, in the illustrations and general context, this rate of three per cent. serves for the exact truth, it cannot, in practice, be regarded as anything better than an approximation.

percentage. Of course, to gain any degree of accuracy in the operation of such a system—and without accuracy it would avail nothing—all factors affecting the total volume of money must be taken into consideration. If, for instance, China decided to embrace the Gold Standard, it would be necessary for monetary authorities to meet the increase in the demand for gold by special reductions in the quantity of the metal per money unit. On the other hand, a decision by the French authorities to abandon the Gold Standard should not be ignored. Other potential factors may be summarised: the absorption of gold by the arts and for industrial purposes; the discovery of new gold fields; the spreading use of deposit banking in preference to currency; and newly effected economies.

From the point of view of economic stability, a decline in gold production should be regarded, not as a menace, but as a matter for rejoicing. Gold scarcity is no more a factor to economic disequilibrium than abundance. The latter sets in motion a number of forces tending to continue along the same straight line even when the supply becomes normal in relation to price levels, and thus magnifying the evil effects of a subsequent decline in gold production. The artificial absorption of redundant metal by the opposite process to devaluation cannot be entertained—remember *auri sacra fames*, whereas scarcity can be offset by a universally acceptable process. And not only that, scarcity will give the monetary authorities of the future the opportunity of preserving long-run equilibrium in the economic life of the world without any need for departing from the convenience and utility of an effective gold standard.

Since Great Britain is a great creditor country, it may be argued that she should be the last to propose devaluation as a remedy for gold scarcity. If this is so, the recently expressed apprehensions of a number of British economists are illogical, and so is the complaint that the national debt is growing as a result of the post-war rise in money values. And if, considering everything, a plentiful supply of gold is desirable, then so is devaluation when gold is scarce. Those individuals who have fixed-interest investments at home and abroad, have benefited considerably during the recent rise of money

values, and if the rise is allowed to continue in consequence of gold scarcity their accidental gains will continue to grow. Should these people be compelled to forgo the latter increments to their incomes, or not? Truly, the whole question involves moral as well as economic considerations; and there is more than meets the eye in Sir Josiah Stamp's caption, 'Gold, the Arbiter of Destiny.'

In the meantime we can only pray that central banking co-operation will go forward with rapid strides; for no matter what measures may be taken to offset declining gold production, international central banking co-operation will be the first condition to universal economic stability, and will facilitate the launching and operation of any scheme that may be adopted to meet future necessities.

E. J. BROSTER.

Art. 4.—EGYPT AND JUDICIAL REFORM.

EGYPT has always been the land of mystery to the rest of the world, and among the many riddles it presents to the average foreigner none is more bewildering than the judicial system or systems under which its laws are administered. It is inevitable that once Egypt has settled her thorny political problems with England and the outside world, and has time to set her house in order, she will turn her attention to the chaotic state of her Judicature, and the long overdue reforms needed to sweep away the caltrops and entanglements which lame the feet of Justice there, and afford convenient aid to the rogues and vagabonds in her territory. Any proposed scheme of reform must concern the foreigner who resides permanently or temporarily in Egypt; and in order to protect himself, and at the same time to view sympathetically the action of a reforming Egyptian government, such foreigner should be educated to a general understanding of the existing complications and defects in the judicial system, and have some clear idea of the bearing of the reforms necessary to equip the country with such a well-organised and harmonious administration of Justice as is essential to ordinary civilised government. The object of this article is to throw light on the major obscurities of the system in practice and to sketch out some of the more obvious reforms which suggest themselves to a servant of the Egyptian Government who has had much experience of both the Egyptian and the International Courts.

Fifty-four years ago the chaos in the system of Judicature, resulting from the usurpations of the Powers and the hopeless incapacity of the Native Courts, was reduced to something like order by the Khedive Ismail's great Minister, Nubar Pacha, who, after years of laborious negotiation, persuaded the Powers to agree to the institution of the '*Jurisdiction de la Reforme*.' The Mixed Tribunals opened their doors with the blessing, more or less qualified, of the Powers, and in a very short time gained a large measure of the confidence of the foreign colonies; a confidence which, in spite of occasional '*breezes*,' they have kept. Later the Native Courts were reorganised, and though the results were not immediately striking, the addition, early in this century, of a few

English Judges at each centre rapidly raised these Courts to a high degree of efficiency, especially in the criminal matters with which they were largely concerned.

The system thus instituted, though an immense improvement on what had preceded it, was nevertheless, as it remains to-day, one of the most cumbrous and expensive with which any country has been burdened. First, there are the Mixed Courts, consisting of three First Instance Tribunals in Cairo, Alexandria, and Mansourah, and a Court of Appeal, which has its seat in Alexandria. These Courts try all civil cases between foreigners of different nationality, and between foreigners and Egyptian subjects. Their criminal jurisdiction is limited to certain contraventions, offences in bankruptcy, and offences against the Courts themselves. Then we have the Native Egyptian Courts with a series of First Instance Tribunals in various Mudirieh centres, and a Court of Appeal sitting in Cairo. Recently a second Court of Appeal has been instituted at Assiut in Upper Egypt. These Courts try all criminal causes and civil actions between Egyptians and Egyptians, except those dealing with personal status: the First Instance Courts try all criminal causes grouped under the designation of contraventions or delicts, while Courts of Assize, drawn from the Court of Appeal, hold assizes at the various Mudirieh centres for the trial of offences classed as crimes. From these Courts of Assize there is no appeal, except to the Court of Cassation on point of law. The Court of Cassation is also constituted from the members of the Court of Appeal. None of these Courts have jurisdiction in what is known as 'statut personnel' which falls within the province of the Religious Courts, or *Mehkemeh Sharie'*. These Courts also comprise First Instance Courts and an Appeal Court, or *Grand Mehkemeh Sharie'*; and, in addition, various recognised religious bodies exercise jurisdiction as regards their co-religionists by what are known as *Megalis Milli* (Councils of the Nations). Lastly come the various consular Courts, still exercising their curtailed privileged jurisdiction. They decide all civil actions between their own nationals, as well as all criminal cases, other than the few minor offences handed over to the Mixed Courts, in which one of their nationals is an accused party.

Such is the Babel of jurisdictions which the unfortunate

Egyptian has had to tolerate for over half a century ; the amazing thing is that in spite of everything these discordant elements have worked as well as they have done for so long a period. Nevertheless, for some time past there have been signs that the old machinery was wearing out and that the framing of an Egyptian Judicature Act must occupy the attention of Egyptian statesmen as soon as the political situation may make it possible. To begin with, the congestion of work in the Mixed Courts is such that it has not only attracted the unfavourable attention of the public by reason of the delays entailed, but has seriously affected the health of the Judges of the Courts, owing to the strain of coping with the flood of work which descends on them in undiminished volume year after year. This inundation of cases is, moreover, only to a limited extent due to the natural expansion of business. For part of it the Courts are themselves to blame : for instance, in the first flush of their newly-acquired powers they developed an appetite for absorbing cases which really belonged to the rival Native jurisdiction, and by their recognition of the doctrine of the 'prête-nom' (which is little better in most cases than the fraudulent creation of a foreign interest so as to bring a case which really concerns Egyptians only within the Mixed jurisdiction), let loose upon themselves additional work, from which they have sought in vain to disembarass themselves in recent years. Again, their early decisions extended their jurisdiction beyond the Capitulatory Powers concerned in the institution of the Courts so as to embrace, not only various non-capitulatory Powers, but even certain dismembered parts of the Turkish Empire ; and their most recent judgment on the subject, though it refused to admit to the Courts inhabitants of those portions of the Turkish Empire which have acquired independent status since the War, declined to go back on earlier decisions. The Court is, therefore, burdened by cases which it should not be called upon to try.

A far greater source of congestion, however, is the defective system of law which the Courts have to administer. The Mixed and the Native Tribunals have each their separate civil, commercial, penal, and procedure codes, each differing only in certain small particulars but adding to the confusion and conflict of law

in the country. I shall refer to these codes again in another connection ; but the defects in the Mixed code of procedure are the cause of the greater part of the congestion complained of, more particularly in the Court of Appeal ; and it is evident that nothing but a complete revision and modernisation of that code will serve to ease the situation. This has long been recognised. Monsieur Piola Caselli, Conseiller Khedivial, in an address on Modern Civil Procedure given before the Khedivial Society of Political Economy in 1914, speaking of the '*notoriété des défauts de la Justice Mixte*,' admitted that no reproach could be made against the Mixed Bench, but added, 'what can they do with a defective judicial organisation and with a procedure which chokes the audiences under avalanches of cases, which favours fraud and trickery, which mixes in the same heap an ordinary lawsuit about a promissory note and a suit of the highest social interest ?' Without going into undue detail it is sufficient to point out the extreme weakness of the procedure as regards the preliminary weeding out of cases where the defendant does not appear, or only appears to recognise his debt ; of absurd, frivolous, and fraudulent cases ; and of cases capable of compromise. Monsieur Piola Caselli, speaking of judgments by default, mentions that the Mixed Tribunals are obliged yearly to pronounce with all the solemnity of inter-party procedure ('*de la procédure contradictoire*') 11,000 default judgments on an average, of which 8000 at least became final in default of opposition. In England all such cases would be disposed of by a Master on affidavit of regular notification of the summons and default.

To take the Court of Appeal which is the highest Court of the country and whose decisions are final, a casual glance at the duties of a President of one of the three Chambers of which it is composed is sufficient to reveal the cumbersomeness of the instrument which the judges are condemned to use. On the day of audience reserved for the Chamber, instead of the Court having a carefully drawn up list of cases ready for pleading by the advocates, who must be prepared on pain of default, save in exceptional circumstances, to present their considered arguments to the Court for its high and learned deliberation, the President, of all people—the man who is

technically responsible for the decisions of his Chamber, and in whose name and under whose signature all judgments are issued; he who bears the full burden of responsibility, and has to give practically twice the labour of any of his four colleagues—he must attend the Court early and spend about an hour before the sitting in calling over the rôle of from a 100 to a 120 or more cases. Of these his Clerk of Court ('greffier') will have tried to ensure a certain number being ready for hearing, or he himself will have attempted at an earlier audience to fix some of the cases definitely for that day, annotating the rôle 'pour plaider sans faute,' 'dernier renvoi,' 'pour être plaider ou rayee,' and such-like formidable menaces. More often than not even such determination has to give way before the insistence of the advocates in demanding further delays, or before the ability with which one or the other or both together contrive plausible excuses for 'renvoi.' The Court has little power to protect itself by controlling costs or otherwise penalising the defaulting party or advocate. Provided the advocate keeps within the bounds of permissible professional conduct, the President is all but helpless. For the rest, there are small points of procedure to be considered, default judgments to be granted, prorogation of delays in the case of inquiries and 'expertises,' and a hundred and one petty details which should be settled by minor officials, but which find their way into the daily list and waste the time of the Court. The result is unfortunate. At the opening of the legal year it is almost impossible to persuade the advocates to plead, and the Court is not sufficiently occupied: towards the end of the year, in self-defence, the Court has to stem the flood of cases which the advocates then rush forward, by adjourning them 'd'office.' In the best period the curtailment of the time available for pleading and the necessity of getting through a certain amount of work makes the Judges welcome those advocates who are willing to 'se referer aux conclusions,' in which case no pleading takes place, but the Court judges solely upon the written arguments presented by the parties and the documents in the case. It is difficult to imagine a system more wasteful of time, money, and the talents and energies of the Judges called upon to hear these cases in final resort. It is no wonder that, in spite

of all their efforts, arrears accumulate ; while it is entirely to the credit of the Bench that so few decisions show traces of the harassing conditions under which they are given. Briefly, then, the general effect of the code of procedure is that a clever advocate can juggle with it to create delays almost with impunity. The Judges are all but powerless to check abuses of procedure, either by striking out cases, fines, or punitive costs. The value limit to cases which may be brought before the Summary Courts remains at the old pre-war limit of £E100, in spite of the fact that the Native Tribunals have raised their limit to £E250 with excellent results.

There is, moreover, under the existing system a serious waste of judicial material. The only single judge Courts are the Summary Courts ; the First Instance Tribunals being composed of three judges. As in all systems based on the French tradition, there is a certain prejudice against the 'juge unique,' a prejudice which, however natural in a new democracy establishing a judicature of poorly paid judges who could not be trusted to exercise honestly their grudging powers except under the watchful and jealous eyes of their fellows, is not really justified under existing conditions in Egypt. The theory of the necessity of benches of judges in First Instance has already been broken into by the erection of the system of Summary Courts ; there is no longer any sound reason for refusing to allow a single judge to hear civil cases of any amount in first instance where there is an appeal open to the parties ; and the saving in judicial energy apart from other advantages makes the institution of the 'juge unique' worth consideration.

A more delicate matter is the admission to these single judge Courts of the Egyptian members of the Mixed Bench. The Mixed Magistrature counts a certain proportion of Egyptian Judges among its members ; for instance, the Court of Appeal is at present composed of seventeen 'Conseillers,' of whom six are Egyptians ; the Chambers are composed of three foreigners and two Egyptians ; and in the same way the First Instance Tribunals are composed of two foreigners and one Egyptian. But no Egyptian can preside in any Chamber or be appointed a Summary judge. There were at the time of the institution of the Mixed Courts certain obvious

reasons for this arrangement, in a judiciary which was definitely international, and for which it was necessary to secure the confidence of foreign litigants; moreover, at that period an Egyptian Magistrature, in the sense of highly trained and educated lawyers imbued with a deep sense of their responsibility to the public, hardly existed. The situation is different to-day. The Egyptian Magistrates of the Mixed Courts number among them men of the highest ability and integrity who are as capable of filling these posts as any of their foreign colleagues. If there have been from time to time one or two members of the Courts who revealed certain weaknesses of character, it cannot be said that these weaknesses have been confined to the Egyptian Magistrature alone. In any event the proper remedy is not the exclusion of capable men from such posts as Summary Judge, but the exercise of a strict discipline in all cases of failure. The Mixed Courts are, when all is said and done, Egyptian Tribunals, and no reason exists to-day for not making fuller use of the Egyptian material.

I do not wish to be misunderstood in this connection. It will not be politic, in my opinion, so long as the clear line of demarcation exists between the foreign colony and the Egyptian inhabitants of the country, for the higher Presidencies to be held by Egyptian Magistrates, or, in the event of extended criminal jurisdiction being granted to the Mixed Tribunals, for Egyptian Magistrates, to preside over the trial and condemnation of other than their own nationals. They must, as I will explain later, look to their own side of the New Judiciary for the gratification of their natural ambitions as regards promotion and Presidencies. But wherever a 'juge unique' is permitted to try cases subject to appeal in the Mixed Courts or in whatever is hereinafter substituted therefor, I see no reason why that 'juge unique' should not be an Egyptian, equally as an Englishman, an Italian, a Frenchman, or other magistrate of the Courts. Where in the course of hearing, a Court esteems an inquiry necessary, it is the practice to delegate one of its members to hold this inquiry, and the Judge delegated is, as often as not, the Egyptian member of the Bench. Why, then, refuse an Egyptian Magistrate the right to hear alone and decide a paltry affair of a bill of

exchange when, as so often occurs, the conduct of the inquiry in a case of vital interest upon which thousands of pounds depend may be confided by his colleagues of the Chambers, both in First Instance and Appeal, to his sole guidance and authority?

Again, the Appellate system requires serious reconsideration. The Court of Appeal is at present burdened with a vast mass of work from a certain proportion of which it might well be relieved by a readjustment of the matters in which there is an appeal to appellate Chambers composed of First Instance Judges. At present appeals from the Summary Tribunals are heard by such Chambers in all matters other than possessory actions and actions 'en reintegrande,' which are to be brought before the Court of Appeal. The whole of this question requires re-examination from the point of view of relieving the Court of Appeal of the less important appeals, and enabling these elder Judges to devote their mature consideration more fully to the graver issues presented for their decision. The Court of Appeal lists are, in fact, clogged by a number of comparatively simple cases which could be decided by appellate Chambers of lower rank. Moreover, many cases appear before the Appellate Jurisdiction solely because a certain type of advocate regards an appeal as a matter of course, and rarely takes the trouble to present the case properly in First Instance; and here again the Court is powerless to express its displeasure in an effective fashion. Lastly, the mere existence of the rival jurisdiction is a temptation to the less conscientious type of advocate to play off one set of Tribunals against the other. In this way a case between Egyptian subjects can be dragged through the entire series of Native Tribunals, and at the last minute, by the introduction of a foreign element, transferred to the Mixed Tribunals to recommence the whole dilatory procedure.

The Native Tribunals after reaching a high degree of efficiency under the influence of the English Judges introduced into their body (their working experience, for example, of the criminal law has been, and, for the matter of that, still is, greatly superior to that of the Mixed Courts, which are administered by learned civilians who have little or no experience of criminal law and procedure), suffered a very serious eclipse owing to the

political changes following the War. To begin with, they lost practically the whole of their most experienced Judges who were rapidly absorbed into the various Ministries which followed each other at short intervals during the first years of independence. These men, after an average of six months or so of employment as Ministers, went on pension and were lost to the Courts; there were recently no less than twelve ex-Prime Ministers and seventy ex-Ministers in Egypt, all drawing pensions. At the same time the English Judges disappeared, and with them went an element making for character and stability in the Judicial Body. Under political pressure undue expansion in the numbers of the Bench has occurred, which is far from compensating for the loss of prestige due to the disappearance of its most valuable members. Recently the Government decided to abolish the Cantonal Courts instituted under the British régime on the model of our unpaid local justice system. These Courts tried petty cases and were presided over by local notables; while reforms were no doubt necessary, their abolition would appear to have been an error, and must add to the quantity of work thrown on the paid Magistrature. The Courts of Personal Status, though purged of many abuses during the British era, have always suffered from their quasi-religious connection, and from their entire separation from the main judicial body. In any scheme of reform it is certain that they would have to be brought into line with the general judicial system of the country.

As regards the various abortive treaty projects it has from time to time been proposed, provided that the Powers can be got to agree to the abolition of the Capitulations, to throw on to the already overburdened Mixed Courts the civil and criminal cases at present dealt with by the various Consular Courts: indeed, a beginning has already been made in this, and a scheme is under consideration for giving these Courts extended jurisdiction in certain matters arising from the traffic in narcotic and other drugs, and offences against women and children. But the Mixed Courts are already surcharged with civil work, and have neither the machinery nor the experience to render them a satisfactory body to try serious criminal issues. It is evident, therefore, that reform on an extended scale should precede any such alteration in the

existing judicial system of the country. Nothing can, of course, be done until the Powers have agreed to the abolition of the Capitulations. There is a great deal of exaggeration in much that is talked in foreign circles and written in the Press on this subject. Undoubtedly the Capitulations create for the foreigner a privileged position which he dislikes losing: freedom from taxation, immunity from ordinary and reasonable municipal legislation, and so on, such as no other civilised country in the world permits the stranger within its gates to enjoy. Whatever advantages they may afford the foreigner—and many of these are unjustifiable to-day—they undoubtedly are a terrible obstacle to the decent government of the country, and this has been recognised by every statesman who has had to do with the government of Egypt from Lord Cromer onward. The persons who have most to fear from the abolition of the Capitulations are the pimps, procurers, white-slave traffickers, cocaine-mongers, and other vicious elements who find in Egypt under the ægis of the Powers an Alsatia denied them in Europe. In 1903 the late Lord Milner, treating of the Capitulations, said :

‘ It would be hard to exaggerate the amount of injustice or the hideous administrative confusion arising from this state of things. But the immunity often accorded to criminals is not the most serious though it is the most sensational, evil resulting from the abuse of the Capitulations. Of more far-reaching consequence are the obstacles they oppose to every kind of administrative reform and to the general march of progress . . . the Capitulations oppose a solid barrier to this process ’ (i.e. the creation of new offences step by step with the development of public conscience), ‘ alike as regards the suppression of vice and the repression of nuisances. . . . ’ *

The necessary laws can be passed, but not being applicable to foreigners are useless.

‘ In matters of this kind it is precisely the low-class foreigners . . . who are the principal offenders. It is they who are the false coiners, who keep the gambling hells, the liquor shops, the disorderly houses: it is they who build upon canal banks and throw their refuse into the public streets. . . . ’

* ‘ England in Egypt,’ pp. 41, 42, 10th ed.

There has perhaps been some slight awakening of the conscience of the Powers in the matter of crimes committed by their nationals in Egypt, but otherwise what Lord Milner wrote in 1903 holds good to-day. The country moves in shackles which the Powers maintain ostensibly for the protection of their merchants; the chief beneficiaries, however, are the international riff-raff who make fortunes by corrupting the native Egyptians, or by pandering to the vices of the horde of tourists who swarm into the country in the winter months.

To demand the abolition of the Capitulations is one thing, to achieve it is another, for the inveterate habit of the Powers to 'marchander' when this question is raised has hitherto made it a matter of long years even where some very small and reasonable concession has been asked for; it is idle, therefore, to refuse to recognise that this much-to-be-desired agreement is likely to be hard to come by. Yet nearly every other country which was burdened with these antiquated restrictions on liberty has got rid of them to-day, either because they were too strong to make it pleasant for the Powers to insist on their retention, or too insignificant to make it worth while to protest. It is ridiculous to pretend that Egypt is more backward than some of the other ex-provinces of the Turkish Empire, or indeed than the Turkish Empire itself; but, unfortunately for Egypt, she combines a supreme significance for the Powers with a weakness which enables them to dictate to her with impunity. On the other hand, the fears of the foreign colony, even if largely exaggerated, as to their position before the Courts, once they have to submit to local jurisdiction in all matters, are natural enough and can only be pacified by the establishment of a thoroughly competent judicial system throughout the country; the Powers are evidently not going to concede the desired abolition unless one of their number guarantees the equitable working of the Egyptian judiciary as regards the foreigners newly coming under its authority—at least, during a certain number of years. That Power can but be the Power which has hitherto exercised tutelage over Egypt, and still accepts responsibility for her behaviour to her foreign population. There would have to be a complete reform of the judicial system under British guidance—a fact which the forms

of treaty hitherto proposed do not seem to have adequately taken into consideration.

It may not at the outset be palatable to Egyptians to recognise this necessity for a British guarantee, but it is practically certain that Egypt cannot obtain what she wants without it. It is perhaps as well, for this among other reasons, that the much-discussed treaty is to all appearances likely to be laid by for a considerable period, owing to the impossibility at present of finding an Egyptian Government able to conclude a permanent agreement; for the present Government, admirable though it is, only maintains its position by an artificial arrangement of influences, while the only Egyptian party with a majority at its back justifies far too obviously by its general attitude the fears of the foreigners called upon to surrender their privileges. Assuming, however, that the necessary agreement is arrived at with the Powers, it would be possible, no doubt, to confine the reforms to the Mixed Courts, but I venture to say that this would be a very unstatesmanlike solution and detrimental to Egyptian interests. The situation would then offer an unrivalled opportunity for a complete overhaul of the judicature by the passing of a species of Judicature Act amalgamating all the Courts and creating one great judicial system for all Egypt. Nor need such a reform be of a character to alarm unduly those whose business interests are involved. Sir William Brunyate's otherwise excellent project, for instance, was ruined by an entirely unnecessary suggestion that the English language should become the principal language of the Courts, and that the whole fabric of the law should undergo a species of anglicisation, a suggestion which naturally terrified the foreign Bar, and which nothing could justify in view of the interests affected, and the long tradition of a Latin system of Justice in the country. Under a reasonable scheme of amalgamation the Mixed Courts, fortified by a *personnel* capable of dealing with the criminal work apportioned to them, would merely become the foreign Division of the Judicature; the Native Courts would become the Egyptian Division, and the *Mehkemehs Sharie'* with their kindred Courts, the *Megalis Milli*, the Divisions of the *Statut Personnel*.

The most important change in the present system

would be the institution of a Supreme Court of Cassation ; this would be a body interpreting in last resort points of law from the three sides of the Judicature. The necessity for such a body has long been felt by all the Courts ; both the Mixed Court of Appeal and the Native Court of Appeal, for instance, resort to a system of 'Chambres Réunies' in certain conditions such as a conflict between decisions of equal authority ; but this arrangement, consisting as it does of the entire Court of Appeal sitting as one Chamber (or in the case of the Native Court of Appeal of fifteen members of the Court at least), is found extremely unsatisfactory and cumbrous. The Mixed and Native Courts also have their Cour de Cassation applicable to judgments in penal matters only, made up from the members of the Court of Appeal : in the Native Courts the judges who heard the case may also sit. The decisions of the Grand Mehkemeh Sharie' are final. None of these extraordinary Courts supplies adequately the want of a Superior Court capable of establishing legal precedents for all Divisions. The suggested Supreme Cassation Court would be selected from the most eminent judges on the Bench, and would be a permanent Superior Court sitting to solve all points of conflict and establishing harmony between the various Divisions ; it might be composed of four foreign and four Egyptian members, of whom seven should form a Court, there being two Presidents, a foreign and an Egyptian, who would preside according as the 'pourvoi' came from the foreign or from the Egyptian Division, the remaining six members being equally divided between foreigners and Egyptians. The value of such an exalted body to all the Courts would be incalculable, and the Native Courts, no longer overshadowed as they are to-day by the prestige of the Mixed Tribunals, would be the first to benefit by the steady effect of the Higher Jurisdiction.

It is impossible here to go into details of organisation, but the reform should allow under certain circumstances for the interchange of judges between the Divisions ; and the power of transferring a case from one Division to the other by the introduction of an 'élément étranger' should be limited. With a unified Court of Cassation above them the Divisions would have to respect each other's decisions. So far as possible, moreover, I am in

favour of housing the various Divisions in one building, for it is certain that the Judges, particularly those of the Native Court and the Mehkemehs, lose by the want of contact with their foreign colleagues, due to the separation of the various Tribunals.

The new Courts should administer the same set of codes throughout the country, and one of the principal duties of the commission entrusted with the preparation of the reforms would be the revision of these codes. The Civil and Commercial Codes should obviously be based on those used by the Mixed Courts which have benefited by fifty years of interpretation by competent civilians; a draft Penal Code of a thoroughly modern and advanced character was drawn up during the last years of the War and passed the revision of a number of the highest legal authorities in Egypt, among them the late Sarwat Pacha; this code has been printed and is filed in the Ministry of Justice. As regards the codes of Procedure, the Civil and Commercial Code will require almost complete remodelling in order to adapt it to the needs of the Reformed Courts. The existing Criminal Procedure Code of the Mixed Courts is a useless and rusty instrument, the greater part of which has never been used by the Courts. It is a pity that the committee at present sitting to revise it, in view of the recently proposed extension of the delictual jurisdiction of the Mixed Tribunals, should have taken, as I understand they have, this code as the basis of their labours, instead of the Native Code d'Instruction Criminelle, a valuable code which from time to time has incorporated many principles of English criminal procedure, and has been in active use for many years; this code might well serve as a base for the new Criminal Procedure for all Courts. With regard to *Statut Personnel* considerable work in codifying the law has been undertaken of recent years, and the object of the new revision should be to evolve a system which would meet the requirements of all the religious bodies.

The main object of the various revisions should be the establishment of a uniform body of law applicable to all persons Egyptian and foreign within the jurisdiction; the provision of machinery for the reference of possible conflict in decisions of the various Divisions to the Court of Cassation; the strengthening of the hands of the

judges as regards the penalising of parties seeking to abuse the procedure of the Court ; and the economising of the use of judicial material. The latter point is of serious importance, for the Egyptian Government is at present paying a sum for its judicial service out of all proportion to the population of the country, and not far short of the total amount paid in salaries by England for its judicial staff. It is not that the individual salaries are too high, but that the numbers required under the existing system of multiple Benches, the defects in the procedure, the abuse of appeals, the want of co-ordination of the various jurisdictions, and the want of check on claims that are practically undefended, lead to waste of effort on the part of the judges employed and undue multiplication of their numbers.

I have made no reference so far to the legislative powers vested in the Mixed Courts. Under the modification of article 12 of the Mixed Civil Code established by Law 17 of 1911 the initiative in legislation appertains exclusively to the Government, the Legislative Assembly (i.e. the Mixed Court Judges sitting in Legislative Assembly) having the power to make additions to, or amendments of, mixed legislation ; and no such legislation can be promulgated without their approval by a two-thirds majority. The General Assembly of the Court in ordinary session can also submit to the Minister of Justice proposals for the reform of mixed legislation, so long as such proposals do not touch any question dealt with by the Statute of Judicial Organisation.

As at present exercised, the powers thus delegated amount to little more than the right of veto, where the Court hesitates to admit the application to foreigners of a law passed by the Egyptian Government : the Court is far too busy to make a more serious use of even these restricted legislative rights. It is, however, certain that, if and when the foreign colonies become subject to taxation by the Egyptian Government, they will have to be given some form of representation ; and to the body in which they have this representation, whether parliamentary or other, should be transferred these powers. This should not prevent the Courts from being equipped with full authority to enact their interior rules and orders ; but to leave to one Division only of a Court of Law, constituted

as under the scheme above outlined, legislative powers of this character would be invidious, even were it not the case that the judicial duties of the Magistrates make it practically impossible for them to find the time for the proper exercise of such extraordinary functions.

Great care, finally, would have to be exercised to secure the independence of the Courts, especially of the Egyptian Divisions. Political influence has been too marked a feature of recent appointments to the Native Tribunals, to the serious detriment of the prestige of these Courts. At present the Presidents and Councillors of the Appeal Courts and the Judges of First Instance are appointed by Decree on the proposal of the Minister of Justice and with the advice of the Council of Ministers, and only the Councillors of the Courts of Appeal are irremovable before the pensionable age of sixty. In the Mixed Courts both the Councillors of the Court of Appeal and the Judges of the Tribunals are irremovable before the pensionable age, which is sixty-five in the case of Judges, and seventy in the case of Councillors : they are appointed by the Egyptian Government, but the various European Governments represented have a right of veto over the nomination of their respective representatives.

This veto would probably have to be maintained ; but it might be advisable to place a check on the excessive political colouring necessarily given to Egyptian appointments by the system of nomination at present employed. It is true that in England political appointments to the High Court are the rule, but what works well enough in England, where a politically appointed judge rarely displays serious political bias in his decisions, does not necessarily work so well in Egypt. It might be advisable to confide the original nomination of all judges to a Commission formed of the Minister of Justice as political officer with the titular rank of President of the Judicature (equivalent to our Lord Chancellor, and like him losing his office with the fall of his Government, but without effective judicial powers, in this respect resembling the titular Egyptian President of the Mixed Courts who used to be appointed purely *causa honoris*), and four Councillors of the Court of Cassation, chosen in such a way as to give a majority of Egyptian members in the case of Egyptian nominations and a majority of foreign members in the

case of foreign judges. This would serve to make the appointment of incompetent persons for purely political reasons more difficult. At the same time the irremovability enjoyed by First Instance Judges of the Mixed Courts should be extended to all First Instance Judges.

This is, of course, nothing but an outline of the reforms proposed: the important point is that the thorough examination of these proposals and the preparation of a draft Judicature Act should not be left until the consent of the Powers has been obtained to the abolition, or the modification, of the Capitulations. It would be an act of far-seeing statesmanship to prepare at an early date for this much-desired eventuality. But, to be effective, the work must be undertaken seriously: it cannot be done by casual commissions made up, as is the practice in minor matters, of members of the State Legal Department, and Judges in active work, sitting a few hours a week. Such far-reaching reforms must necessarily take a number of years for the evolution of a complete and satisfactory scheme, and can only be accomplished by a Permanent Committee appointed *ad hoc* and sitting *de die in diem* until completion. The sooner such a Commission is appointed the better, nor is there any reason why the Egyptian Government should hesitate to commence an undertaking of such vast importance to the future of Egypt because the political conditions under which it would become effective seem for the moment to have suffered a check. The Egyptian Government should be prepared with their scheme and ready to launch it whenever agreement with the Powers may be reached, and this is hardly likely to be earlier than the two or three years which the elaboration of the various reforms will indubitably require. The cost of such a Commission, in view of the immense benefits to be expected from its labours, would be negligible; for it is no exaggeration to say that the future prosperity of the country is bound up in the establishment of a sane, uniform, economical, and independent judicial system within its borders.

A. C. MCBARNET,

Conseiller à la Cour Mixte, Alexandria.

Art. 5.—OUR EARLY ETYMOLOGISTS.

1. *Ductor in Linguas, the Guide into Tongues.* By John Minsheu. London, 1617.
2. *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae.* By Stephen Skinner. Ed. Henshaw. London 1671.
3. *Etymologicum Anglicanum.* By Francis Junius. Ed. Lye. Oxford, 1743.

FOR the etymological part of his Dictionary Dr Johnson relied almost exclusively on Stephen Skinner's '*Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae*' and the '*Etymologicum Anglicanum*' of Francis Junius. Both these works were compiled almost a century before the Doctor produced his own first edition (1755). They enjoyed an authority comparable to that of Ménage's '*Origines de la Langue Française*' (1650), and, well into the nineteenth century, continued to be quoted with respect by all writers on philological subjects. The fact that Junius was of foreign origin, while Skinner was a true-born Englishman, may have had some influence on the Doctor's opinion as to their relative merits,

'For the Teutonic etymologies I am commonly indebted to Junius and Skinner, the only names which I have forborn to quote when I copied their books; not that I might appropriate their labours or usurp their honours, but that I might spare a perpetual repetition by one general acknowledgement. Of these, whom I ought not to mention but with the reverence due to instructors and benefactors, Junius appears to have excelled in extent of learning, and Skinner in rectitude of understanding. Junius was accurately skilled in all the northern languages, Skinner probably examined the ancient and remoter dialects only by occasional inspection into dictionaries; but the learning of Junius is often of no other use than to show him a track by which he may deviate from his purpose, to which Skinner always presses forward by the shortest way. Skinner is often ignorant, but never ridiculous: Junius is always full of knowledge, but his variety distracts his judgment, and his learning is very frequently disgraced by his absurdities.

'The votaries of the northern muse will not perhaps easily restrain their indignation when they find the name of Junius thus degraded by a disadvantageous comparison; but whatever reverence is due to his diligence, or his attainments,

it can be no criminal degree of censoriousness to charge that etymologist with want of judgment, who can seriously derive *dream* from *drama*, because life is a drama, and a drama is a dream; and who declares with a tone of defiance, that no man can fail to derive *moan* from *μόνος*, who considers that grief naturally loves to be alone' (Preface to the Dictionary).

Although this is altogether unjust, for, while Skinner was an amiable and cultured amateur, Junius was a great scholar and linguist, the Doctor here indicates the besetting sin of our early etymologists, their determination to trace everything to a Greek original. It is, however, hardly fair to credit Junius with the *dream*=*drama* equation, for he only quotes it from Meric Casaubon, who derived practically the whole English vocabulary from Greek.

The study of one's native language belongs only to an age of culture and national consciousness. The linguistic occupations of the Middle Ages, confined to the few learned, were almost entirely classical. The vernacular excited neither interest nor curiosity. The few scattered etymological conjectures to be found in medieval writers tend, as a rule, only in the direction of edification, just as their artless tales seem to exist only for the purpose of pointing a moral or deducing a theological parallel. Philippe de Thaun's derivation of *vendredi* from 'veritatis dies' can hardly have been intended literally, any more than, at a later date, Bishop Latimer's explanation of a *homily* as a sermon in 'homely' language. Even in the nineteenth century could Carlyle really have believed that the *King* is the 'cunning' one, or Archbishop Trench that the *husband* is the 'band' that unites the 'house'? Junius, who was an accomplished Scandinavian scholar, gives what is substantially the correct etymology of *husband*, but writers went on repeating the early fable. Trench quotes it with apparent seriousness from Tusser, and an American lexicographer has recently gone one better by explaining the *husband* as one who is 'house-bound'!

The sixteenth century saw in most European countries an awakened interest in the vernacular and in the earlier native literature. Clément Marot admired and edited Villon. Spenser admired and imitated Chaucer. The antiquary, and the etymologist made their appearance,

just as they had done in the most high and palmy state of Rome, when Varro, 'most learned of the Romans,' wrote his four hundred books, including his 'De Lingua Latina.' It was to the Roman grammarians, such as Varro and Festus, both of whom were edited by the younger Scaliger, that the Renaissance philologists went for information and guidance. From them they derived their fantastic theories of derivation, the most amusing of which is the invocation of antiphrasis. This is exemplified by such etymologies as 'mons a non movendo,' 'bellum quia non bellum est,' 'lucus a non lucendo,' etc. On this principle Scaliger identified *cold* with Latin *calidus*. Another device is the anagram. The theory of our own etymologists that *woman* stands for 'woe-man' was perhaps inspired by the suggestion, to be found in the 'Etymologiæ' of Isidore of Seville, that *Eva* is an anagram of *vae*! Not that the work of the Roman grammarians is negligible. Living nearer to the words they discussed, they had an acuter perception of their essential meanings. Much fantastic nonsense has been printed about the etymology of *explore*. It is only recently that modern philologists have discovered in Festus the quite logical explanation of *explorare*, to cry out, i.e. to 'descry,' or announce by a shout, the presence of the game or the enemy.

The Renaissance etymologist was at a great disadvantage in dealing with the origin of his own language. He knew nothing of the inter-relation of languages or of phonetic laws. Accustomed, himself, to the more or less scholastic language that had sprung from classical Latin, and directly or indirectly from Greek, he supposed these classical tongues to be the origin of his own speech, and thus based his theories on a most airy foundation. The resemblance of a modern European word to a Greek word did not suggest to him an original kinship, but a direct borrowing from the ancients. This delusion, which persisted into the nineteenth century, was assisted by the traditional mythical history of northern Europe, in which Trojans, Greeks, and Romans were inextricably mixed up, and by almost complete ignorance of the earlier forms of the vernacular. If a learned theologian, the etymologist would seek the origin of a modern European language in Hebrew, while some French antiquaries,

delving into the earlier history of their nation, became Celtomaniacs and derived everything from the unrecorded languages of ancient Gaul. It is true that they seldom had any knowledge of Celtic, but this only gave more elasticity to their methods. Thus, President Fauchet, one of the most learned and enthusiastic of French sixteenth-century antiquaries, derived *brigand* from the 'Celtic' *brig*, a bridge, because the crossing of bridges offers the best opportunity to the robber. But Greek was the great stand-by of the Renaissance philologist. The great Isaac Casaubon solemnly derived *radoter* from *Hérodote*, while his son Meric, prebendary of Canterbury, went one better by finding the origin of *cockney* in the Greek *οικογενής*, domestic, home-bred!

It was inevitable that the early etymologists should notice that the superficial resemblance between Greek and Latin words and those of their own language was subject to certain disturbances. They explained these by apocope, syncope, metathesis, etc., very useful terms, of which Minsheu gives an explanation in his 'Guide into Tongues,' but of which they made a use which staggers the modern student. Voss, in his great 'Etymologicum Linguae Latinae,' published at Amsterdam in 1662, begins with sixty terrifying folio pages 'De Literarum Permutatione,' from which it may be inferred that any sound may become any other sound. This general law seems to have been grasped by one of our own early investigators, who, realising that the mysterious word *pod* is the 'home' of the seed, opines that the word 'seems to have been formed from *δόμος* by transposition, thus *μόδος*, and then, converting the μ into π , *πόδος*, contracted to *pod*.' Similarly, Ménage, whose 'Origines de la Langue Française' (1650) is the first French etymological dictionary, derives the unexplained *marcher* from Latin *varicare*, from *varus*, which some explain as knock-kneed and others as bandy-legged. Since Molière caricatured him in 'Les Femmes Savantes,' Ménage has been rather a joke to the layman, but few *érudits* of the age enjoyed a higher or more lasting reputation. He was a great and modest scholar, and, even if he did achieve such acrobatic feats as deriving *chez* from *apud* and *foie* from *hepar*, his pioneer work is most valuable.

The first in date of our own etymological dictionaries

is that of John Minsheu. His 'Ductor in Linguas,' or 'Guide into Tongues,' was published, after great difficulties, in 1617. It gives, besides etymologies, the equivalents of each word in ten other languages. I once possessed three copies of this great folio, but, at the suggestion of Mr Philip Snowden, have recently parted with two of them. This is the first book printed in England with a list of subscribers, whose generosity alone made its publication possible. In fact, as one scans its vast and crowded pages of small print, much of it in Greek and Hebrew character, one wonders that any press of those days was equal to the work. Still more does one wonder whether, in our own day, the richest and noblest in the land would lend their help so freely to a struggling scholar, who had 'not only spent thereon all his stock and substance, but also run himself into many and great debts, impossible for him ever to pay.' The list of subscribers begins with the King, the Queen, the Prince. The episcopate and the nobility make a good show. Oxford and Cambridge are represented by the heads of most Colleges, among whom we note Dr Laud, President of St John's College, Oxford. Then we have the Benchers of the various Inns of Court and the grouped headmasters of Pauls, Westminster, Marchant Tailors, Christs Hospitall, and Suttons Hospitall (i.e. Charterhouse). Especially interesting is the name of Sir Henry Spelman, 'fift undertaker for great summes, when the work lay dead at the presse for want of mony.' Spelman was a typical cultured gentleman of a cultured age, an original member, with Camden and Cotton, of the Society of Antiquaries. He himself published a valuable 'Glossarium Archæologicum' and founded an Anglo-Saxon readership at Cambridge. His glossary, a comprehensive explanation, historical and etymological, of administrative 'Latin,' is not yet superseded.

One is glad to record that Minsheu's colossal work actually reached a second edition. It is still an indispensable aid to the study of Tudor English, and, amid its many and obvious absurdities, it is possible occasionally to pick up a few valuable facts. He seems to have been a good modern linguist, especially in Spanish, and to have had a competent knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, from the last of which he is fond of deriving Anglo-Saxon

monosyllables. Of Anglo-Saxon he naturally, like his contemporaries, knew little, and his wild Greek etymologies of *daisy* suggest that he had never read Chaucer. Having no real predecessors in this country, he relies chiefly on foreign scholars, especially the ancients. In his Epistle to the Reader he mentions Plato, Varro, Festus, Quintilian, Isidore, and, among moderns, Joseph Scaliger. He divides etymologies into three classes—'vera, verisimilia et ad placitum'—and it must be owned that the last of the three classes is well represented in his Guide. So far as I know he is the originator of the derivation of *apron* from 'afore one.' Correspondence of the initial letter is usually enough to lead him to a Latin or Greek origin. Thus *arrow* is from '*arundo*, a reede, because in the old time the arrowes were made of reedes.' *Pageant* is still a puzzle to etymologists, but Minsheu has the interesting conjecture that it comes from 'page' and 'giant,' because both these figures are usually represented in such shows. *Poltroon* he naturally derives from French, but explains the French word as from Latin *pullorum latro*, a fowl stealer. Skinner, on the other hand, derives it from *pollice truncato*, one who had amputated his thumb to avoid military service. This fantasy seems to have originated with Saumaise (Salmasius), 'the Varro of his age,' who succeeded Joseph Scaliger at the Academy of Leyden: it was widely accepted by his learned contemporaries, is repeated by Johnson, and was still in school-books when I was a boy. On the other hand, Minsheu gives what is now accepted as the substantially correct origin of *dismal*, from Latin *dies malus*, unfortunately followed by *dismay*, which 'taketh the name from the moneth of May, for in that moneth the flowers of the field, though never so beautifull, withered by the fervent heat of the sunne, hang their heads and fade away.' Like other etymologists of the age, the absence of any possible Latin or Greek original drives him into the region of the fantastic, as when he explains *stepmother* as one who 'steps' into the place of a 'mother,' and the cognate Dutch *stiefmoeder* as 'rigida mater.' His comic etymology of *demure* from French *de mœurs* is as good an example of a persistent myth as the 'house-band' delusion. Junius treats it as a joke—'Suo more ludunt qui ex *de mœurs* dictum putant,' but

it is found in Johnson, even in the first edition of Skeat (1882), and is solemnly reproduced in Funk's Standard Dictionary (1922). So much for Minsheu. Quite apart from word-lore, his work contains vast and various information for every kind of archæologist, and I can think of few better single volumes for an intelligent Robinson Crusoe.

If Minsheu was, in Ben Jonson's opinion, a rogue, his successor, Stephen Skinner, appears to have been a man of very attractive character. An Oxford man and an M.D. of Heidelberg, he travelled widely and intelligently at a time when travelling was still an adventure, finally settling as a doctor in Lincolnshire, where, in 1667, at the age of forty-four, he died, a beloved physician, 'amicis carus et post obitum diu deflendus,' to quote his friend Henshaw. The latter, a travelled and cultured man and an original F.R.S., edited, in 1671, the 'Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae,' which Skinner had left in manuscript. The author's own preface acknowledges his debt to Continental scholars such as Ménage and Voss, but he is hard on Minsheu—'Industriam eius probo, judicium & fidem non probo. Multa absurde, multa violenter, tanquam rudentibus detorquet. Saepe, ne etyma desint, vocabula ex proprio cerebro comminiscitur.' Skinner had access to a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon which was denied to Minsheu, for Somner had published, in 1659, his 'Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum.' Consequently, though Skinner wrote in Latin and still attributed to the classic languages too large a share in the creation of English, he recognised the essentially Teutonic origin of the language. Thus, he discards Minsheu's derivation of *hag* from 'Hecate,' and quotes the Anglo-Saxon *hægesse* from Somner, mentioning the cognate German *hexe*. Unfortunately, following his practice of offering the student an ample choice, he mentions an alternative etymology from Latin *saga*, a witch, 'cum nihil vulgarius sit quam sibi in spiritum & e contra transitus.' Sometimes, as in the case of *habergeon*, he puts forward three etymologies, the second introduced by 'vel potius' and the third by 'vel, quod omnium verisimillimum est.' *Garlic* is explained by Minsheu as 'garden-leek,' with a long account of its medicinal virtues, including his own experience on a

ship which, owing to contrary winds, took six weeks to get through the Straits of Gibraltar. On this occasion garlic 'proved so cordiall that it did dissolve and heat all the raw humours which the cold and ill water had bred in my stomacke.' Skinner, no doubt with Somner before him, interprets it correctly from Anglo-Saxon *gar*, spear. The permutation of initials worries him as little as it does Minsheu. He mentions the latter's etymology of *pageant*, but prefers as an origin the German *wagen*, in the sense of processional chariot. Johnson, it may be mentioned, inclines to '*pagan giant*, a representation of triumph used at return from holy wars; as we still have the Saracen's Head.' But Skinner has more than a glimmering of semantics, e.g. for *benumbed*, which Minsheu derives from Hebrew, he gives correctly the Anglo-Saxon *benomen*, observing that 'Nos de pedom paralyti laboranti dicimus, "his legs are taken away."' So, also, he gives the correct etymology of *taint*, from *tangere*, instead of the mistaken etymology from *tingere* (which appears even in the last edition of Skeat)—'ut vulgo dicimus, "it has gotten a touch."' Some young researcher in quest of a dissertation subject might do worse than investigate the life of this gentle and learned country doctor.

Skinner often quotes Dr Th. Henshaw's opinions on etymological questions, and, as Henshaw prepared the MS. for the press, it is possible that some of the chief absurdities of the Etymologicon are not to be put down to Skinner himself. The latter gives what are now the accepted etymologies of *bumpkin* and *newfangled*, but, with his usual modesty, also mentions Henshaw's views, according to which *bumpkin* is derived from *pumpkin*, as a staple food of the class, and the Chaucerian *newefangel* is connected with the 'new evangel,' presumably the ideas of Wyclif! One of his quaintest articles is that on *burly*, 'q.d. *boorlike*, i.e. agricolæ similis. Agricolæ enim, propter labores & inde plenum victum corpore grandiores sunt. Nisi malles ortum a Teut. *gebürlich*, decens, decorus, quia *εὐσπαρία*, cum aliqua, sed non enormi, pinguedine viro decora est, femina indecora.'

Francis Junius was an older contemporary of Skinner and lived to a great age (1589-1677). Like some other early investigators of our language, such as Joseph

Scaliger and Meric Casaubon, he was a foreigner. Of French descent, he was born at Heidelberg, travelled extensively, mastered the Scandinavian languages and Frisian, became librarian to the Earl of Arundel, edited Cædmon and the Gothic Bible of Ulfilas, bequeathed his Anglo-Saxon manuscripts to the University of Oxford, and was buried in St George's Chapel, Windsor. It is interesting to note that he was the brother-in-law of Voss, the founder of Latin etymology. Another philological marriage of the Renaissance was that of Isaac Casaubon with a daughter of the great scholar-printer-lexicographer house of Estienne. Junius is frequently mentioned by Skinner, who no doubt possessed some of his numerous philological works, but his great *Etymologicum*, which must have been compiled before Skinner's, remained in MS. at the Bodleian, till it was edited, in 1743, by Edward Lye, an enthusiastic student of the Scandinavian languages. In the meantime Hickes had published (1703-5) his '*Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus*,' the study of which led Lye to the Oxford MS. of Junius. His edition, with his own comments and supplementary matter indicated by an L, is a noble specimen of Oxford printing. Junius writes in a less chatty style than Skinner. Sometimes, in place of an explanation, we are simply referred to Voss, Ménage, Meric Casaubon, etc., whose works are presumed to be found in every gentleman's library. He also sets a new example by quoting copiously from the classics, and also from Chaucer, Gavin Douglas, Ulfilas, Tatian, Otfried, etc. Some of his articles are masterly, e.g. that on *harangue*, which provoked the derisive bray of Horne Tooke. Some are intensely comic, their absurdity being usually due to attempts to link up Anglo-Saxon with a Latin or Greek original. Thus *empty* is associated with 'emetic,' *home* is ultimately Greek *ἄμα*, at once—'ut proprie denotet locum ubi simul esse solemus,' and *freeze* is from Greek *φρίσσειν*, to bristle and shudder. It is interesting to note some of the changes of meaning that had come about while Junius's MS. was waiting for print. He gives the correct etymology for *buxom*, obedient, to which Lye adds, '*Buxom* ita a veteribus accipitur. Nunc vero ut plurimum usurpatur de puella hilari, alacri, laeta.' For Junius a *hearse* is 'cenotaphium, tumulus honorarius'

(' Underneath this sable hearse . . . '), for Lye 'feretrum ab equis tractum.'

Lye was able to lay under contribution the work of the Celtic scholar, Edward Lhuyd, who published his 'Archæologica Britannica' in 1707. Both Skinner and Junius also refer frequently to John Davies, whose 'Antiquæ Linguae Britannicæ Dictionarium' appeared as early as 1632. Davies appears to have been a bit of a Celtomaniac, ready to derive any English word from Welsh, e.g. *denizen* from *dinaswr*, a citizen, but equally ready to derive any Welsh word from Greek, e.g. Old Welsh *haiarn*, iron, from ἄρης, the god of war. Junius also mentions his friend John Nicholas Vaughan, 'Cambrobritannus, vir humanissimus,' who quite convinced him that a *wicket* takes its name from Welsh *gwich*, squeak, 'quoniam rarius recluditur, atque ob hoc ipsum rauco rubiginosorum cardinum strepitu hominum aures plerumque offendit.'

It is easy to laugh at the odd fancies of these old scholars, who knew nothing about phonetics or Grimm's Law, but some of us envy their profound knowledge of Latin and Greek, to which many of them added something more than a bowing acquaintance with the chief modern European languages. Nearly all of them were wandering scholars, who occasionally exchanged the pen for the sword. They were no phoneticians, but they were invariably linguists, a qualification sometimes lacking in the equipment of modern writers on word-lore.

ERNEST WEEKLEY.

Art. 6.—BUCKINGHAM PALACE.

Buckingham Palace. Its Furniture, Decoration and History. By H. Clifford Smith, F.S.A. Country Life, 1931.

THIS magnificent volume begins with the statement that Buckingham Palace has undoubtedly usurped the proud claim of Windsor Castle to be the greatest house in the Empire. To upholders of historic tradition, like the 'Quarterly Review,' this is heresy. Windsor Castle, whose foundations are laid deep in English history, was the heart of our monarchy for centuries, while the site of Buckingham Palace was still a marshy meadow by Tyburn's banks. Windsor has given the family name to our reigning dynasty, and as long as monarchy remains in this country nothing can usurp its proud position as the chief house of the Empire. It is, however, far from our intention to deny or minimise the very high place that Buckingham Palace has by now acquired in our history and feelings.

It may be said that Westminster Abbey is the shrine of the past and the glorious abiding proof of the continuity of our history. St Paul's is associated with national thanksgivings and the dignity and power of the City of London. Whitehall is associated with government; and the Palace of Westminster, in spite of historic traditions, is only associated with the seat of Parliament—and that association is in these days a cause of mixed emotions.* St James's Palace, the titular seat of our monarchy, is, except for Levees and Conferences, more associated with the past than with the present.

It is interesting to note, however, that when George III bought Buckingham House it was essentially only as a residence. In no way was St James's to be deprived of its position as the seat of the Court, and it was only during George III's last years and illness that Queen Charlotte held her drawing-rooms at Queen's House.

* In a house almost under the shadow of Westminster Abbey there is a very fine pictorial map of the City of Westminster in which the House of Commons and the premises of the Gas Light and Coke Co. are alike labelled 'gasworks'—an exaggeration, no doubt, but one which many people will feel to be not without justification.

Buckingham Palace stands alone as the embodiment of the present and living monarchy. It is true that King Edward VII died (as, indeed, he was born) there; but otherwise the Palace is associated entirely with the lives of our sovereigns and their work. It is, so to speak, a living centre of emotion rather than in any way a monument of tradition. To children it is the immense and mysterious house guarded by red-coated sentries of almost inhuman magnificence and immobility; it is also the place whence on occasion the King appears in full glory of regal raiment in a gold coach, and where on many days the band plays and the guard is changed. To the society debutante it is the scene of the delightful trepidation of presentation at Court. To recipients of honours it recalls the pleasing ceremonies of investiture. To many thousands it conjures up visions of royal garden parties in July. To the more select few it stands for State dinners and State balls. To ministers it must remain the place of receiving the seals of office and of delivering them up again.

To us all it is the centre of irresistible attraction at times of national emotion which we wish to share with our Sovereign, whether it be anxiety, like the night of Aug. 4, 1914 (and, indeed, during the King's illness in 1928), or joy and relief, such as we experienced on Armistice Day, or simply the national holiday feeling of festive occasions such as royal marriages.

The republican, the crank, the anarchist, the revolutionary may pour out his frothy torrent in Hyde Park or on Tower Hill, but when we are really moved, when we wish to express our truest feelings, we go neither to Hyde Park nor to Tower Hill, we inevitably go to call (if we may use the expression) on our King, and that call is made at Buckingham Palace. Great is our rejoicing when he and his family show themselves on the centre balcony facing the Queen Victoria Memorial. At such times we feel the throbbing of the true heart of London.

A Quarterly Reviewer wrote in 1826 that 'London is singularly deficient in all those ornaments which in foreign cities produce the most striking effects at first sight. Our only arch is Temple Bar; our only fountain is in the Middle Temple.' The reviewer in 1931 can claim that we have travelled far since then. The intervening century

has inflicted on us so-called ornaments in plenty. In small ways have we not the Poets' Fountain in Park Lane and Epstein's 'Rima' in Hyde Park? At least it must be added that the period has given us the Cenotaph, Peter Pan, and other fine memorials. If in larger adornment it has inflicted on us the Natural History Museum and the Albert Hall, it has also given us many fine public buildings. Moreover, it has given us Buckingham Palace (with no less than three different eastern façades) and the new Mall, with the Admiralty Arch and Queen Victoria's statue to complete the setting.

In the early chapters of this book Mr Christopher Hussey, working on material given to him by Mr Clifford Smith, tells us the history of the site from the time of the Mulberry Gardens, planted by order of James I in the pious hope of fostering the silk industry and blessed with a grant of 120*l.* a year to provide leaves for the silkworms. This silk industry was not a success, and in course of time the gardens, or at any rate a part of them, degenerated into a place of popular amusement, described by Pepys at one time as 'a very silly place, worse than Spring Gardens,' though Evelyn, writing in 1654, refers to Mulberry House as 'the only place of refreshment about town for persons of the best quality to be cheated at, Cromwell and his partizans having shut up and seized upon Spring Gardens, which till now had been the rendezvous for the ladies and gallants of this season.' On the site of the Mulberry Garden was built Goring House, named after its owner, the famous or notorious cavalier. By 1674 it was Arlington House, called after Lord Arlington of the Cabal, who obtained possession of the property after a long fight at law with Goring, who had been dispossessed during the Commonwealth and had returned to find his house in other hands.

To Arlington succeeded John Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, who rebuilt the house in 1703 and renamed it after himself. After his death the occupation was continued by his very remarkable and autocratic widow, to whom the house was left on condition that she did not remarry, and here she lived in semi-royal state. In 1742 she died, having first made her ladies promise that, if she should lie senseless, they would not sit down in her presence till she was dead. Her only son had died before

her, and the property passed to her husband's illegitimate son. In 1762 it was purchased for 28,000*l.* by George III. The young queen had found St James's Palace very uncomfortable, and, though it was still used for ceremonial purposes, the Court soon took up residence in Queen's House as Buckingham House was then renamed. At the same time the King gave up the official Dower House in Somerset House. The Queen's House remained essentially the private residence of the sovereign.

I have before me as I write a letter from George III to George Grenville written in 1765. It is on ordinary paper with no official superscription of any kind, only 'The Queen's House' in the King's own handwriting. That is typical of the informality which then characterised the place—it was no palace, just a dignified, red brick, moderate-sized house with projecting wings enclosing a courtyard. It was a house far less pretentious than many of the country mansions inhabited by George's more important subjects.

It remained for George IV to make it a palace. The rebuilding and glorification of the old house by Nash was one of the distractions and occupations of George's later years, even though he did not live to take up residence in it. The work was continued by William IV, but so little enamoured of it was he that when the Houses of Parliament were burned down in 1834 he offered the still unfinished building as a substitute. Luckily, the offer was not accepted. What George IV and William IV did not do in twelve years Queen Victoria did in about as many weeks, and the Palace was at last occupied. In July 1837 the Queen wrote to the King of the Belgians: 'I *really* and *truly* go into Buckingham Palace the day after to-morrow, but I must say that though I am glad to do so I feel sorry to leave for ever my poor old birth-place.' In January 1840, however, she wrote: 'I shall have no great dinners because the large rooms in the upper storey here are not ready yet.' So the house was not even then finished.

The courtyard was then open on the east side, except for the Marble Arch which occupied the centre. By 1845 the Queen found the Palace entirely inadequate for the demands of Court and family, and she wrote to Sir Robert Peel about the urgent necessity of doing something:

'Sir Robert Peel is acquainted with the state of the Palace and the total want of accommodation for our little family. . . . It will be for Sir Robert to consider whether it would not be best to remedy all the deficiencies at once and to make use of this opportunity to render the exterior of the Palace such as no longer to be a *disgrace* to the country as it is now.' The result of this was the building of the eastern side of the quadrangle and the removal of the Marble Arch. The new front was completed in 1847, according to the designs of Blore. It was over-ornamental and not over-dignified, but in mitigation it may be pleaded that what the Queen required was a large number of secondary rooms needing many windows, and not a range of State apartments, the fenestration of which gives the architect scope for a dignified façade. This same difficulty beset Sir Aston Webb when the whole front had to be refaced without displacing a single pane in a single window. How greatly he succeeded where Blore failed is obvious to all who see the Palace now.

During the forty years of Queen Victoria's widowhood the Palace became almost like a house of the dead, an impression in no way dispelled by the ever increasing dinginess and dirtiness of its front, due to the unsuitable stone used. The Queen never stayed there unless compelled by circumstances of State, and then only for the shortest possible period. Her happy association of twenty-one years' married life there made visiting it alone a cause of sadness, as when she wrote in her diary on the day before the 1887 Jubilee: 'I am writing after a very fatiguing day in the garden at Buckingham Palace where I used to sit so often in former happy days.'

At Buckingham Palace, as at Windsor, everything that could be kept exactly as it was in the Prince Consort's day was so kept. The veto on change was absolute. Hence King Edward, after his accession, found an immense amount of renovation and bringing up to date necessary. Sir Lionel Cust, in his 'King Edward VII and his Court,' tells us of the zest and energy that the King put into the work and of his uncompromising condemnation of the state of the Palace as it was. The Grand Hall he called the Sepulchre from its intensely gloomy aspect, and much of the rest of the house was in keeping. With Sir Lionel and others to help him with expert advice as to pictures,

furniture, and decoration, King Edward set the work in hand at once. He, as Sir Lionel tells us, professed to know nothing about art, but he did claim to know about arrangement. The Palace still bears ample proof of the King's careful and wise judgment, but his reign was short and his energies expended in many other directions as well. Much, therefore, was left over to the present reign. The interest shown by the King and Queen in the Palace has been continuous, and in room after room, especially in the semi-state apartments, the expert knowledge and experienced good taste of Her Majesty are made evident.

Mr Hussey takes us round the outside of the buildings explaining what was there before and how the present conditions have come. It is a most interesting tour, and Mr Hussey an excellent guide and instructor. When he leaves us we are taken over by Mr Clifford Smith, to continue our tour inside. He writes with the authority of his high position in the Victoria and Albert Museum and of much study and expert knowledge acquired over many years. His massed information concerning the contents of the Palace is expressed in an attractive and lucid style. During the compilation of this book he was given access to all available records, and opportunities of studying his subject such as no other writer has been given. He also had the advantage of the active assistance and encouragement of Her Majesty the Queen, to whom it may be claimed this book is a just and proper tribute. It may be added, moreover, that Mr Clifford Smith has a special claim on the interest of readers of this Review, in that he is a grandson of the eminent Sir William Smith, who was for so many years its distinguished editor. Having now introduced our guide, let us follow him through the rooms of the Palace, as learners rather than as critics, for criticism requires specialised knowledge, which on this occasion is certainly outside the range of the ordinary reviewer or reader.

The first question that arises naturally is, where did the furniture and the contents of the Palace come from? When Buckingham House was being considered for purchase as a residence for the Prince of Wales (afterwards George II) in 1723, the Duchess of Buckingham demanded 60,000*l.* for it—a colossal sum in those days,

but she declared that it was cheap at the price. At any rate it shows that the house must have been magnificently furnished. Nothing resulted from the negotiations then, and unfortunately when George III bought the house in 1762 none of the contents were left in it. The King and Queen had to begin again, but as both were keen collectors with a sound discrimination in furniture, works of art, books, and ornaments, we can realise that the result must have been very fine, judging from the few pieces that remain, such as Queen Charlotte's book-cases and tables. We are given an interesting illustration of King George's Octagon Library, a striking and well-filled apartment, notable as the scene of his reception of Samuel Johnson. The King and Queen also naturally drew furniture and ornaments from other royal residences.

When Queen's House was being rebuilt by George IV the contents had to be stored elsewhere, largely in the cellars of Carlton House—and unfortunately little returned thence as, by then, other fashions had succeeded and the Regency period was in the ascendant. The allusion to Carlton House gives Mr Clifford Smith an excellent opportunity for making an interesting digression in showing us how that house was furnished by the Prince of Wales with the help of advisers, like Henry Holland. There are excellent records of who made the furniture and when, and what was paid for it and the changes carried out during the three periods of George's career as Prince of Wales, Prince Regent, and King—periods all reflected in the interior of Carlton House. Much of this furniture was afterwards transferred to Buckingham Palace, and another source of supply was the Pavilion at Brighton after its sale. Some special pieces like Queen Mary II's writing cabinet, which deserves notice, were brought from Kensington Palace.

To write of the contents of the various rooms would be to compile an inventory, requiring expert skill unless it is to be intolerably dull to the reader. We can therefore give but scant notice to the various rooms as Mr Clifford Smith takes us through them. We begin with the Grand Hall, now very different from King Edward's 'Sepulchre.' Thence, passing up the Grand Staircase, which occupies the same position as in Queen's House, we come to the Guard Chamber, the Green Drawing

Room, and the Throne Room. Passing thence we go through the White Drawing Room, with its very fine Louis XIV furniture; the Music Room, with the old Regency piano from the Pavilion and George III's remarkable astronomical clock; the Blue Drawing Room; the State Dining Room, with its splendid row of full-length royal portraits; and the West Gallery, with its Gobelins tapestry, to the Ball Room, the scene of Courts and similar State functions—and we may well be amazed by the dignity of these rooms and their appropriateness. After leaving the Ball Room we pass through the State Supper Room, the Cross Gallery, the East Gallery, notable for its splendid series of eighteenth-century portraits, to the Picture Gallery, which, for its size, houses one of the finest collections of Old Masters in the world, a treasure house for which we have largely to thank George IV, who, with all his glaring faults, at least can be credited with an eye for what was good in art and a desire to acquire it.

And so we pass from the State apartments, and Mr Clifford Smith takes us downstairs again to the semi-state apartments, beginning with the Household Dining Room, with its unaltered Nash decorations, and thence to the Household Breakfast Room, the 1855 Room, the Bow Room, which is the way out to the garden and terrace, the 1844 Room, and the Carnarvon Room, which commemorates an interesting bit of history connected with the Palace. It is called after the Marquess of Carnarvon, son of the Duke of Chandos and Lord of the Bedchamber to George III. He it was who recommended the purchase of the house by the King. We then pass to the Belgian Rooms, which are reserved for the most distinguished of visitors, and the very names of which are attractive—the Eighteenth-Century Room, the Orleans Bedroom, the Spanish Dressing Room, and the Regency Room. In these rooms we find special proofs of Queen Mary's skill and taste. Not only have damasks and other stuffs been rescued from the oblivion of storerooms and turned into curtains and upholstery, but the rooms themselves have been redecorated under Her Majesty's direction, and been largely furnished with pieces bought by her for the royal collection. We then proceed to the East Front, and here too in many rooms we find the Queen's influence and handiwork. The Yellow Drawing Room has a

fine Chinese paper, also rescued from storerooms, and further Chinese decoration in the Centre Room, whence we look along the Mall. Having finished our tour of the apartments, we are given by Mr Clifford Smith, as an epilogue, chapters on the lacquered furniture and on the historic clocks and barometers.

In France and in Russia, in Germany and in Austria—and to this sad list must now be added Spain—the last two generations have seen the passing of royal palaces which in most cases had roots deep in history and were steeped in tradition while Buckingham Palace was still undreamed of. Their bodies may remain as museums or institutions, but their spirits have vanished. They are dead monuments of a more romantic past. It is not so with Buckingham Palace. It may harbour no ghosts of grim tragedies of bygone days, but it stands ever more firmly rooted in the present. Just as, when it was built, it was on the fringe of London with fields beyond, but now, as a result of London's expansion, has become geographically the centre, so it has become, as the residence and working place of the Sovereign, the heart of our social and constitutional life. The subject is a regal one, and this book both outwardly in type, illustration, and binding, and inwardly in historical and artistic information and value, is worthy of the subject. Can more be said?

JOHN MURRAY.

Art. 7.—LIGHT ON THE MYSTERY OF THE 'MARY CELESTE.'*

THERE is always something peculiar about a mystery of the sea, particularly in a case where a criminologist has set himself to solve a problem. The Sphinx was, after all, merely half a woman of the land dwelling by a river bank near a Greek village when her secret was penetrated by the landsman Œdipus; whereas, Davy Jones, under old Father Neptune, has a locker and a cupboard of skeletons which, time and time again, have been tapped and shaken up only to give forth a tantalising rattle of bare bones to the listener on the other side of the massy locks and barnacled panels. Ashore, some day, the identity of the Man in the Iron Mask may be revealed, because, in some musty bundle of records now reposing in the French national archives, a document yellow with age and rottenness may chance to reveal its secret to an investigator not really looking for it. The riddle of the personality of John of Gaunt, aristocratic defender of Wicliffe, may, after all, be some day made clear, since a cache of documents may turn up which escaped the fury of the destroying monastics of the fourteenth century.

Afloat, nothing may draw from the depths of the 'unplumbed, salt, estranging sea' either the manner or the place of the death and foundering of some good men and famous ships. The water washes away all traces of the unconfined murdered and not only the guilt of the murderer, and not all our radio waves, television, latest devices of wireless directional navigation, faster and faster electric turbine steamers and Diesel-engined motor ships have succeeded in killing the mystery of the sea. It is needless to glance at the green-backed volumes, filed year after year in Lloyd's 'Graveyard of Lost Ships' at the new quarters in the Royal Exchange, London, to find that hardly a month passes without the recording of the name of some well-found steamer or sound windjammer 'lost and missing.' Indeed, in 1930 and the first three months of 1931, at least six good steam and sailing ships, of European ownership alone, vanished on the high seas, leaving no trace of

* Copyright in U.S.A. World Copyright reserved.

wreckage or evidence of their fate. Yet, of all the skeletons in the cupboard of that hoary sinner and mystery-spirit, Davy Jones mariner, nothing is stranger than the riddle of the fate of the officers and crew of the world-famous American derelict brig 'Mary Celeste,' about whom and which has grown a mountain of legend as fantastic as that which clings to the barnacled hull and rotting shrouds of Vanderdecken's 'Flying Dutchman.' I believe, however, after searches among unpublished archives in places sundered apart by the width of the Atlantic, that I have obtained evidence which, to-day, were the suspects alive, would justify Scotland Yard or the Sûreté Générale of Paris in arresting them on grave suspicion of complicity in the crime of murder or piracy on the high seas.

Fifty-eight years ago, this staunch ship was found derelict in the North Atlantic. She was a brigantine of 282 tons, and had left New York for Genoa, Italy, on Nov. 7, 1872, freighted with alcohol, stowed in casks in her hold. The captain, Benjamin S. Briggs, an American citizen, was part-owner of the ship, with James H. Winchester, a New York shipowner; and aboard on the last fateful trip, were the captain's wife and young child, the mate, Albert C. Richardson, the second mate, Andrew Gilling, the steward Edward C. Head, and a crew of four seamen—Germans—by name: Walkert Lorenzen, Arian Hardene, Boy Lorenzen, and Gallhib Gondschat. We mention these names in detail because legend-makers and 'fakers' of salt-sea yarns speak of Sams, Bills, Gingers and Dicks not known to the sailing list, any more than was a certain picturesque spiritual descendant of George Washington who, with admirable caution and great foresight, in the 1890's, bequeathed a posthumous diary purporting to give his adventures aboard the 'Mary Celeste' on her last voyage, before he settled down ashore as cook and bottle-washer to a schoolmaster, in London.

Meteorologists in Great Britain note that the year of the sailing of the ship was the 'most remarkable weather year of the century,' rain and cold were prolonged far into the summer, and were succeeded by an amount of electrical disturbance of the atmosphere unparalleled within living memory. Severe gales raged all over the

Atlantic, in the latter part of November 1872.* For about seventeen days, the ship held on her course across the Atlantic, till, at 8 a.m. on Nov. 25, somebody wrote on the deck slate log that she passed to the north of the island of Santa Maria, in the Azores, which bore S.S.W., six miles distant. Then something strange and inexplicable happened, which caused the 'Mary Celeste' to be hastily abandoned by all aboard. What that was is one of the most baffling of all mysteries of the sea.

Twelve days after this last entry on the ship's records, the British brig, 'Dei Gratia,' of Nova Scotia, Captain Morehouse skipper, bound from New York to Gibraltar for orders, sighted a strange ship, her jib and foremast staysail set, sailing on the starboard tack, but in so strange and erratic a fashion, that Morehouse decided to close in and hail her. He signalled, but there was no answer. 'I reckon she's a derelict,' he said to the mate, Oliver Deveau, and ordered him and two seamen to go aboard and investigate. When the boat got under the ship's counter, they read the name 'Mary Celeste.' They climbed aboard and searched the ship thoroughly. Not a soul was to be found, on deck or below, and there was no response to the seamen's shouts. She seemed sound and seaworthy, had plenty of food and water, but no papers. The mate examined the ship's log book, and found a last entry, dated Nov. 24, when the 'Mary Celeste' was in lat. 36.56 N., long. 29.20 W. The boarding party then saw a strange sight in the cabin. All the six windows had been battened up with planking. It appeared like a miniature fortress. No food or drink was on the table, and it looked as though the officers had abandoned the ship in hot haste or sudden fright. In the fo'c'sle, the seamen's chests of clothes were quite dry, and the razors left behind showed no trace of rust. Not a crack appeared in the paint or planks of the 'Mary Celeste,' and if she had met bad weather, why did a phial of sewing-machine oil stand upright by a reel of cotton and a thimble? Would not the rough seas have spilled that oil? Why, too, as was the case, were the spare panes of glass, stowed away in the ship, unbroken, while a harmonium, music and books in the captain's

See the 'Annual Register,' 1872.

cabin were dry and uninjured? The perplexed captain of the 'Dei Gratia' ordered the mate and two of the crew of his ship to take the derelict into Gibraltar, which they reached on Dec. 13, 1872, a day after the arrival of the 'Dei Gratia.'

The British naval authorities were confronted with a marine riddle such as the oldest and most experienced man among them had not heard or read of. When their sea-sleuths examined and compared the logs of the 'Mary Celeste' and the 'Dei Gratia,' they were surprised by a remarkable circumstance, which deserves more attention than it has yet received. Between Nov. 25 and Dec. 5, when the 'Mary Celeste' apparently was abandoned by her crew and she was actually sighted by the 'Dei Gratia', the derelict ship seems to have held on her course, for ten days, with the wheel loose, and no one at the helm in all that time. Now, the distance of the longitude of the place where the 'Mary Celeste' was found, from that of the island of Santa Maria, as shown by the last entry in her log, is, according to reckoning of the Admiralty experts at Gibraltar, 9.54 degrees (eastwards), which, at lat. 40, is equal approximately to 507 land miles. 'It appears almost impossible,' say these experts, 'that the derelict should have compassed within the same time, a distance of 9.54 eastwards, at all events on the *starboard* tack, upon which she was met by the "Dei Gratia," when the log of the "Dei Gratia" shows that the wind was blowing from the north all that time, and the ship was on the *port* tack all that time.' Stripped of its nautical technicalities, this seems to mean that, during those ten days the position of the sails of the 'Celeste' *must* have been altered by someone, and the 'obvious inference is that the "Mary Celeste" was not abandoned till some days after the last entry made in her log.' *

Here arises a question! What was happening aboard the 'Mary Celeste' after Nov. 24 and 25, which prevented the captain and his officers from making an entry in deck or ship's log? There must surely have been some remarkable occurrence to cause this breach in the normal duties of the ship's navigators, leading up to the climax

* F. Solly Flood's report to the British Board of Trade.

when she was hastily abandoned to the mercy of wind and wave. A special correspondent of the 'New York Herald,' writing from Bangor, Maine, on Jan. 21, 1911, says that in the mate's—Albert C. Richardson's—cabin on the derelict a slate was found, bearing the words 'Fanny, my dear wife' at the end of records of wind, weather, and temperature. But I have not seen in the official reports of the Supreme Registry Court at Gibraltar any hint of such tragic entry on the slate. Richardson was a native of Stockton, Maine; but where is to-day the log of the 'Mary Celeste'? When the Marshal of the Vice-Admiralty Court at Gibraltar, Mr T. Vecchio, entered the cabin of the derelict, he picked up from the floor a curious sword. . . . 'I have examined it,' writes Consul Sprague to the Assistant Secretary of State at Washington, D.C., 'and it is evidently of Italian make, and bears a cross of Savoy on the hilt. It remains in the custody of the Court. The chronometer and ship's papers cannot be found.'

The story of the growth of the legend of the 'Mary Celeste' is amazing in that, in their efforts to solve the mystery and to pierce the clouds of fantasy and sheer brazen lying, woven by a generation of mariners in grog-shops and taverns on the wharves and quays of Wapping, Liverpool, and New York, aided by unvarnished journalists and writers, on both sides of the Atlantic, so few have tried to focus attention on the evidence of a most important eye-witness—the man who first boarded the 'Mary Celeste' after her abandonment—by searching the facts as recorded in the archives of the Supreme Court of Registry at Gibraltar. Had this evidence been examined and pondered over as it has been, apparently for the first time in half a century, by myself, it would have saved a great deal of very fruitless and futile conjecture and many tall stories.

Oliver Deveau, the first mate of the 'Dei Gratia,' offered some remarkable testimony when the inquiry into the abandonment of the 'Mary Celeste' was heard before Sir James Cochrane, etc., Judge and Commissary of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Gibraltar, on Dec. 18, 1872. Two facts emerged from this evidence, both highly damaging to the weavers of inaccuracies and nautical legends. One story was that when the boarders

first entered the cabin of the 'Mary Celeste,' they were startled to find a table laid for breakfast which had been only half eaten. Listen to the sworn evidence of Oliver Deveau :

'I went into the cabin within a few minutes of sounding the pumps. On the table there was the log slate, but I cannot say what else might be on the table. I do not know whether there were any knives. I saw no preparations made for eating in the cabin. There was plenty to eat, but all the knives and forks were in the pantry. The rack was on the table, but no eatables. There was nothing to eat or drink in the cabin on the table, but preserved meats in the pantry. I examined the state of the ship's galley. It was in the corner of the forward house and all the things, pots, kettles, etc., were washed up. Water in the house a foot or so deep. I cannot say how the water got in, but the door was open and the scuttle hatch off. The windows were shut. There were no cooked provisions in the galley. I never saw the water come over the topmast of a vessel. There was a barrel of flour in the galley, one third gone. We used the provisions found on board the "Mary Celeste." We used potatoes and meat, and she had, I should say, six months' provisions on board.'

The second remarkable fact—full of significance in the attempt to solve the mystery of why this well-found and provisioned ship was abandoned—is certain to be new to those who have tried to get at the facts. Oliver Deveau and another sailor found, to their surprise, on their first entry into the ship, that the cabin, slightly raised above the deck, had all its windows battened up with canvas and boards !

'There were six windows, two in the captain's, one in the mate's, one in the w.c., one in the pantry, and one facing bow of the ship. They were all battened up with canvas and boards. I knocked one off in the mate's room. All the others remained the same as I found them.'

Deveau's story of the sighting of the 'Mary Celeste,' as he told it, on oath, to Sir James Cochrane, is interesting, and plays its part in sweeping, like the free winds of the ocean, through the fog of untruth which surrounds the 'Mary Celeste' :

'I left New York on Nov. 15, bound for Gibraltar for orders, Captain Morehouse, master. On Dec. 5, about

1.30 p.m. sea time, being my watch below, the captain called me and said there was a strange sail on the windward bow, apparently in distress, requiring assistance. I came on deck and saw the vessel through a glass, when she appeared to be about 4 or 5 miles off. The master proposed to speak the vessel to render assistance, and to haul wind for that purpose, which we did. By my reckoning, we were 38 degrees 20 N. lat., 17 degrees 15 W. long. We hauled up, hailed the vessel, but found no one aboard. I cannot say whether the master or I proposed to lower the boat, but one of us did, and I and two men went in her to board the vessel. The sea was running high, the weather having been stormy, though then the wind was moderating.

'I boarded the vessel and the first thing I did was to sound the pumps which were in good order. I found no one on board the vessel, which had three and a half feet of water in the pumps. The pump gear was good, but one of the pumps was drawn to let the sounding rod down. There was no place to let the rod down without drawing the box, as is often the case in a small vessel. . . . I only used the other pump on my way here, and the first pump I left in the same state as I found it.

'I found the fore hatch and the lazarett hatch both off. The binnacle was stove in. There was a great deal of water between decks, the forward house was full of water up to the combing, and is on the upper deck. I found everything wet in the cabin, in which there had been a great deal of water. The clock was spoilt by the water. The sky light in the cabin was open and raised, and the compass in the binnacle was destroyed. I found all the captain's effects had been left—his clothing and furniture. The bed was just as they had left it, and that and the other clothes were wet. I judged there had been a woman on board. I found the captain's charts and books in the cabin—some were in two bags under the bed, and two or three loose charts lay over the bed. I found no charts on the table. I found the log book in the mate's cabin on his desk. The log slate I found on the captain's table. There was an entry in the log book up to Nov. 24, and an entry on the log slate, dated Nov. 25, showing that they had made the Island of St Mary. I did not observe the entry on the slate, the first day, and made some entries of my own on it, and so unintentionally rubbed out the entry when I came to use the slate, at least I thought so. I did not find the ship's register or other papers concerning the ship, but only some letters and account books.

'I found the mate's note book in which were entered

receipts for cargo. . . . I found also the mate's chart in his cabin, hanging over the mate's bed, showing the track of the vessel up to the 24th. There were two charts in the mate's cabin, one under and one hanging over the bed, as I have said. I am not positive whether the chart with the ship's track marked on it was found above or below the mate's bed. There seemed to be everything left behind in the cabin as if left in a great hurry, but everything in its place. I noticed the impression in the captain's bed, as of a child having lain there. The hull of the vessel appeared in good condition and nearly new. There were a great many other things in the cabin, but impossible for me to mention all. The things were all wet. The skylight was not off, but open. The hatches were off, the cabin was wet but had no water in it, as the water had naturally run out of it. The masts were good, and the spars, but the rigging was in very bad order and some carried away. The foresail and upper fore-topsail had apparently blown from the yards, and the lower fore-top-sail was hanging by the four corners. The main stay-sail was hauled down and lying on the forward house as if it had been let run down. Jib and foretop stay-sail set. All the rest of the sails were furled.'

The legend that the crew of the 'Mary Celeste' quitted the ship in a highly mysterious manner in which her boats had no part is not, of course, borne out by the evidence of Deveau :

'The "Celeste" had not accommodation on deck for two boats. One could see where the boat had been lashed across the main hatch, but that was not the right place for her. There were no lashings visible; therefore, I cannot swear that she had any boat at all. . . . Nothing to show how the boat was launched, and no signs of any launching tackle.'

It is clear that the legend, so well propagated, has been largely based on these words of Deveau : 'Therefore I cannot swear the "Mary Celeste" had any boat at all.'

Sir James Cochrane : 'Can you form any idea why the officers and crew so mysteriously abandoned the "Mary Celeste" ?'

Deveau : 'My idea is that the crew got alarmed, and by the sounding rod being found lying alongside the pumps, that they had sounded the pumps and found perhaps a quantity of water in the pumps at the moment and thinking she would go down, abandoned her.'

When the inquiry into the mystery was resumed two days later, Deveau made a remarkable answer to Sir James Cochrane's question :

'How do you account for the fact that, as you say, the "Mary Celeste" ran 500 or 600 miles, with no one aboard, and the sails set as you found them ?'

Deveau : 'I cannot give an opinion whether the derelict could have run the distance where we found her, in the intervals, with the sails she had set. We passed to the north of the group, while the "Mary Celeste" passed to the south. . . .

'The men's clothing was all left behind, even their oil-skin boots, and even their pipes, as if they had left in a great hurry. My reason for saying they left in haste is that a sailor would generally take such things with him, especially his pipe, if not in a great haste. The chronometer, the sextant, the navigation books were all absent, and the ship's register and papers were not found. There was no log line ready for use. The carpenter's tools were in the mate's room. The water casks were on chocks, which had been moved as if struck by a heavy sea. Below, the provision casks were in their proper places, and not overthrown as they would have been if the ship had been capsized.'

One Cornwell, proctor for James H. Winchester, claimant of the 'Mary Celeste,' asked the judge for restitution of the ship, on payment of salvage expenses, and, in open court, on Friday, Jan. 31, 1873, the judge sharply commented on the conduct of the salvors 'in going away as they have done . . . it is most reprehensible in my opinion . . . and it appears very strange why the captain of the "Dei Gratia" who knows little or nothing to help the investigation should have remained here, while the first mate and crew who first boarded the "Celeste" and brought her into Court have been allowed to go away as they have done. . . .'

A month later, the keen intelligence of Solly Flood, Queen Victoria's proctor and Vice-Admiralty representative at Gibraltar, had been following the alleged blood-stains on the deck of the 'Mary Celeste,' and on a sword in the cabin, with the result that Deveau was put through a severe cross-examination about these marks. He had destroyed some mysterious 'vessel' or container, about which the records seen by the writer of this article are

far from explicit. Enlightenment was also sought by the Queen's Advocate on the origin of the equally strange cuts and slashes about the hull and rails of the derelict :

Oliver Deveau : ' I saw no remains or pieces of a painter or boat's rope fastened to the rail, and I noticed no mark of an axe or cut on the rail. I did not see this cut in the rail now shown me to notice it. The cut appears to have been done with a sharp axe, but I do not think it could have been done by my men while we were in possession of the vessel. I did not see any new axes on board the " Celeste," but we found an old axe. I did not replace the rails of the ship found on the deck before I returned to the " Dei Gratia " for the first time. I can form no opinion about the cause of the axe-cut on the rail.'

Solly Flood : ' Have you any opinion to offer the Court as to the origin of the blood-stains on the deck ? '

Oliver Deveau : ' I noticed no marks or traces of blood on deck. I cannot say whether there were any or not. We never washed or scraped the decks of the " Mary Celeste." We had not men enough for that. The sea washed over the decks.'

Solly Flood : ' Salt water contains chloric acid which dissolves the particles of blood.'

Oliver Deveau : ' If there are some parts of the deck or rail scraped, I did not notice them and they were not done while we were on board.'

Solly Flood : ' Did you pick up a sword aboard the " Mary Celeste " ? '

Oliver Deveau : ' I saw a sword on board the vessel. I found that sword under the captain's berth. I took it from there, and looked at it by drawing it from its sheath. There was nothing remarkable on it, and I don't think there is anything remarkable about it now. It seems rusty. I think I put it back where I found it or somewhere near. I did not see it at the foot of the ladder. Perhaps some of my men may have put it there. I was not on board the " Celeste " when the Marshal came on the ship to arrest her, and therefore I did not see him find the sword.'

Solly Flood : ' The sword has been cleaned with lemon, which has covered it with citrate of iron, which has destroyed the marks of the supposed blood, which therefore is not blood at all as at first supposed, *but another substance put there to disguise the original marks of the blood which were once there.*'

The records of the Court do not state what reply, if

any, was made by Oliver Deveau to these significant statements of the Queen's proctor. Did Deveau clean this sword, and if so, for what reason? On the other hand, of course, it may well be that the original owner, Captain Briggs, had cleaned it. But, in that case, why did Sir James Cochrane, the Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, censure Deveau for 'doing away with the vessel which had rendered necessary the analysis of the supposed blood-stains'? Deveau's evidence on that day, Tuesday, March 4, 1873, concludes: 'It did not occur to me that there had been any act of violence. There was nothing whatever to induce one to believe or to show that there had been any violence.'

When the salvage award was made at Gibraltar, on March 14, 1873, two curious incidents occurred. The first is that, in awarding to the salvors the sum of £1700 (\$8500), the Judge severely censured the conduct of the master of the 'Dei Gratia' in allowing his mate Oliver Deveau to do away with the vessel which had rendered necessary the analysis of the supposed blood-stains on the deck and sword of the 'Mary Celeste.' I have not been able to find anything in the transcript of the evidence in the archives of the Supreme Court at Gibraltar throwing light on the meaning of the Judge's words. But, surely, Deveau must have realised the value as evidence of such a 'vessel' found on the 'Mary Celeste'? The other fact is that, three weeks after the date of the award, the British Judge at Gibraltar, Sir James Cochrane, or Mr F. Solly Flood, the Vice-Admiralty proctor, not only, as the United States Consul said, refused to let Mr Sprague, the Consul for the United States, who was reporting the case to the State Department at Washington, have a copy of the analysis of the supposed blood-stains, but also actually withheld the information from the British military governor of Gibraltar! 'I write this confidentially,' says Sprague. Moreover, not till fourteen years later was the American Consul able to obtain a copy of this secret report from the archives and transmit it to Washington.

It may be said at once that, so far from setting the matter at rest, the bungling analysis of Dr Patron of Gibraltar makes the affair even more mysterious. Patron actually passed his unsterilised finger over a piece of the

evidence, in the shape of timber from the 'Celeste' stained with supposed blood! In fact, so impossible were his methods of analysis, that any bungling agent of an American or European police force who treated exhibits as Patron did would be instantly dismissed. He says: 'From the preceding negative experiments, according to our present scientific knowledge, I conclude there is no blood either in the stains on the deck of the "Mary Celeste" or on the blade of the sword that I have examined.' Patron, of course, lived before the invention of the chemico-biological anti-serum test of Wassermann and Uhlenhuth, which can be used to detect human from other animal blood-stains. Were these evidences from the 'Celeste' in existence to-day, their reaction to these tests would be as certain as though the stains had been made yesterday.

Then what about the character of the crew of the 'Mary Celeste'? Numbers of ancient mariners have appeared in British and American ports, from San Francisco to Liverpool and Wapping, who claimed to be the sole survivors of the mystery ship, and spinning yarns of gore and piracy on the high seas. While the inquiry was going forward at Gibraltar, Consul Sprague received a letter from a German official, T. A. Nickelsen, of Nettersum, Isle of Föhr, Prussia, who wrote that the wives and mothers of two of the crew of the 'Mary Celeste' were anxious to know whether the log book had been found aboard when the crew quitted the ship, and if there were any signs of disturbance aboard. 'I know three of the sailors personally,' wrote Nickelsen, 'they are peaceable and first-class sailors.' Mrs D. T. Morehouse, wife of the captain of the 'Dei Gratia,' wrote a letter to the Boston (Mass.) 'Herald,' in October 1929, saying that her husband and Captain Briggs were 'good honest men, as also was the mate Oliver Deveau. I sailed with my husband, Captain Morehouse, for nine years and never knew any dishonest action. . . . He was captain of a vessel from the time he was twenty years old until he was nearly sixty.' Her letter was written from Buffalo, N.Y., and it is a little curious in view of the distance in time of these events and the fame of this mystery ship in the American press, that I should have before me as I write a letter from the United States Postmaster of Buffalo, N.Y.,

stating that 'this office has no record of her address, and her name is not listed in the city directory.' The methods of tracing addresses are, in the case of the American Post Office, even more thorough than the British Post Office adopts.

When the officers and crew abandoned the 'Mary Celeste,' they left behind chests of clothes of no great value. One trunk was marked as belonging to 'Arian Hardene,' and in the captain's cabin his and Mrs Briggs's effects were found, including clothes, a silk umbrella, a sewing-machine, a harmonium, tablecloths, a small amount of money, a sword, and, be it noted, in view of many made-up statements that Mrs Briggs had no child aboard with her on the 'Mary Celeste,' there were also found a child's armchair, two child's shirts, stockings, a doll, a child's hood, dress, petticoat, and shoes, a box of toys, a child's underskirt, a coat, and the like.

The 'Mary Celeste's' log book, whose present whereabouts I am trying to discover, was found on the ship and sent to Mr C. M. Spence, the American Consul at Genoa. I am informed by Captain H. C. Cocke,* United States Navy, Superintendent of the Office of Naval Records and Library of the Navy Department, of Washington, D.C., that neither the American Secretary of State nor the Secretary of the Navy—both of whom, at my request, courteously ordered searches of the official archives to be made—can find any trace of the log book. Unless a merchant vessel is libelled, says Captain Cocke, her log remains the property of her captain or owner. The last entry on the slate log or deck log, as we noted, spoke of the 'Mary Celeste' as having sighted Santa Maria, or St Mary's Island, in the Azores; but no trace of the landing of the crew of the 'Mary Celeste' on that, or other islands, has ever been found or reported.

What is the possible solution of this mystery? Out of the mass of evidence a pointer emerges. To a modern police scientist or trained criminologist—by which one does *not* mean a writer of detective-'occultist' shockers—it must seem strange that the authorities at Gibraltar,

* The author begs to thank Mr R. L. Sprague, the American Consul at Gibraltar; the Secretary to the Department of Justice at Washington; the Secretary of the Navy Department, Washington; and Captain Cocke, Chief of the Navy Records of the United States, for valuable help received.

in 1872-73, did not set in motion legal machinery in London which would have led to the arrest of the captain, mate and crew of the British brig 'Dei Gratia'! It is evident that, in the hands of a skilful cross-examiner at the Old Bailey, acting for the Public Prosecutor or his Crown contemporary in the 1870's, Deveau, mate of the 'Dei Gratia,' might have been forced to tell the truth, and thereby have put the police on the track of the criminals who made away with the captain, his wife and family, and the officers and crew of the 'Mary Celeste.'

Why, for example, should a respectable seafaring man need to sail under an alias? Captain D. T. Morehouse, of the 'Dei Gratia,' was called 'Boyce' by the owner of the 'Mary Celeste,' Mr James H. Winchester, of New York, who must have known that 'Boyce' was Morehouse. It, also, is curious that the same 'mistake' was made by a Captain Parsons, at one time president of the New York Maritime Exchange, who, in the New York 'Maritime Exchange Bulletin' of August 1913, said he had a chat, 'a year or two later than 1872,' with D. T. Morehouse, master of the 'Dei Gratia,' whom he met at Havana, Cuba, but whom *he* strangely calls 'Boyce'! Why, also, should the mate of the 'Dei Gratia,' Oliver Deveau, twice have destroyed important evidence found on the 'Mary Celeste'? He made away with the mysterious 'vessel,' for which he was severely censured by the British judge; and evidently he cleaned with lemon the supposed blood marks on the picturesque and unusual type of sword in its scabbard found on the floor of the captain's cabin, aboard the 'Mary Celeste.' These do not look like the unthinking actions of a seaman innocent and totally ignorant of the requirements of courts of law and justice. What were his motives in so destroying evidence?

Then, again, he told the court at Gibraltar, that the 'Dei Gratia' left the port of New York on Nov. 15, 1872, or eight days *after* the departure of the 'Mary Celeste'; but I have recently received from a New England port a remarkable letter from the surviving sister of the mate of the 'Mary Celeste,' Mrs Priscilla Richardson Shelton, who in this letter flatly controverts Deveau's statements in court:

'I am the sister of Albert G. Richardson, first officer of

the "Mary Celeste" at the time of the abandonment of that vessel, and the only blood relation of any of the crew, as far as I know, altho' my brother's widow still lives at the age of 84. The last log of the "Mary Celeste" was Nov. 24, 1872. The weather was fair, and no premonition of trouble was mentioned. Where the log is now I am unable to say. . . . The mystery will never be solved, as the only people who could throw any light on the tragedy are the crew of the "Dei Gratia," and they long since disappeared.

' Did it ever occur to you that they were responsible ?

' My late brother, Captain Lyman Richardson, agreed with me that they were. The "Dei Gratia" lay alongside the "Mary Celeste" in New York city. She sailed ten days before the "Mary Celeste," yet was waiting for her and towed her to Gibraltar claiming the salvage money. Where had the "Dei Gratia" been all that time ? The weather had been fair, according to her log, and she should have been far ahead.

' The crew of the "Mary Celeste" were foully murdered. By some means, they were decoyed to the other vessel, or part of them, then the extermination of the rest was easy as they carried no firearms for protection. I am firmly convinced that is the true solution of the mystery.

' Capt. Briggs and my brother were first-class sailors and would never have left their ship unless compelled by force. If they took to the boat, and then saw their error,* some of them would have returned. Albert was a wonderful swimmer, and if some of the crew of the "Dei Gratia" could board the ship, so could they.'

HAROLD T. WILKINS.

* This refers to the conjecture that, frightened by the explosion of barrels of alcohol in the hold, the captain and crew of the 'Mary Celeste' took to the one boat, and when the ship remained undamaged, were unable to regain her decks, because the wind filled her sails and she drew rapidly away from them.

Art. 8.—THE MONASTERIES AND THE REFORMATION.

LET me begin by presenting a few points of view which may make readers understand, even if they cannot share, my conviction that there can be no better defence of the Reformation than to study the preceding five centuries of monastic history. Perhaps the strongest evidence, certainly not the least significant, can be gleaned from a minute survey of their sources of income and their habitual expenditure. But for such details there is no room in an essay like this; and I will turn to other subjects which can be sketched more briefly and from which the same impression emerges.

The *tria substantialia*, the three essentials of the monastic vow from which the Pope himself could not absolve, were Obedience, Poverty, and Chastity. Disciplinarians have pointed out how much the last two contributed to reinforce the first. From a community of celibates, the abbot could claim military obedience in a sense which would have been impossible if wives and children had come in. Again, so long as the vow of poverty was maintained, the monk was economically helpless in the hands of his superiors; he depended upon them for every mouthful of bread and every stitch of clothing. That goes far to explain not only the frequency but the emphasis of St Benedict's prescriptions in this matter of poverty. The very beds of the monks are to be searched for hidden hoards; a thing which has shocked some modern writers, who find it done by medieval visitors and who do not realise that it was explicitly prescribed by the Rule. We may, therefore, profitably begin at this point to consider how little meaning the words of the Rule had for the average monk in Tudor England.

This *Proprietas*, this sin of possessing private property, is, in fact, one of the earliest infractions we find in history; such is the force of natural instinct. St Gregory, who had been intimate with disciples of St Benedict himself, found that a monk of his own had died in possession of a small private hoard, he, therefore, refused him Christian burial, and cast the reprobate's corpse upon the dunghill. Yet, a very few generations later, we find the thin end of

the wedge; the official safeguards are being semi-officially removed. Abbeys by this time had become very rich, and their property implicated them in all kinds of worldly affairs. The abbot was a baron as well as a churchman, with baronial responsibilities to the army and the King's Council, and with a baronial court to maintain. In every great monastery, therefore, it was natural that the abbot's income should be formally separated from that of the monks, with an equally formal agreement as to the financial responsibilities to be borne by each party. It may be said that this had become the rule everywhere before the date of our Norman Conquest; everywhere, therefore, the abbot was a lord, with the *proprietas* of a lord; and the same principle was often followed even in small priories. Thus, silently, the head of the house was legally excused from the original Benedictine vow of poverty. A man of exceptional piety and firmness might maintain it even under these conditions, and live a life all the more meritorious before God in proportion to its constant resistance against ever-present temptation. But, with the large majority, this trend of affairs practically nullified the vow of poverty for the Head of the House.

Then came another stage equally natural, even if we may not call it strictly inevitable. For the convent also had its own worldly affairs. The management of those estates and revenues which were still left to the monks after partition with the abbot involved far more business than even such as would attach nowadays to so many different manors, churches, pensions, and rents, scattered perhaps over half the counties of England and possibly beyond the seas. These things could scarcely have been left entirely to the management of stewards, bailiffs, and lay officials of all sorts, especially in days when business safeguards were so much less easy than at present, and money was so scarce, and so many rents were rendered in kind. Therefore, in every large abbey, the monks' revenues were in their turn subdivided between what may be called the active and the passive members—the *obedientiarii* and the *claustrales*. An 'obedience,' in monastic parlance, was a duty imposed on a man by his superiors; most commonly, an office. The most onerous of these was that of the Cellarer, who had originally the

keeping and distribution of all the conventual stores. The Sacristan had control of the church and its appurtenances; the Precentor, of the services and service-books, the Granator, of the corn, the Chamberlain, of the monks' wardrobes. Other titles, such as Kitchener, Refectorer, Hostillar, Almoner, Infirmarer, explain themselves. In many surviving customals the duties, privileges, and revenues of each obedientiary are set down in clear black and white; but, here again, this earmarking of specific revenues to a specific obedientiary introduced the same problem as the separation of the Abbot's income, with even greater difficulties and complications in proportion to the greater number of persons involved. The concurrent evidence of Visitors, General Chapters, and moralists leaves no doubt that, except at times of exceptional religious fervour, obedientiaries were under constant temptation to the vice of *proprietas*, and had seldom quite clean hands. This, it may be said, is only what one must expect from human nature; and that is precisely my point. The significance of these things seems to me to lie in this, that what stands recorded by unexceptionable historical evidence is just what I find in my own nature and in average human nature around me. When once we have admitted this, shall we not all be ready to go one stage farther? Our appeal to human nature must not be by halves; we must recognise it in its entirety. Is it not natural that the medieval public, after whole generations and even centuries of close observation, should begin to inquire more and more strictly into the superhuman claims and supercivic privileges of men who all the time were showing themselves so very human? For we shall see that the monks, not only in their acts, but even in their words, more and more definitely confessed themselves incapable of living up to their Rule.

Two of the greatest popes, at two successive Ecumenical Councils, judged this question of *proprietas* important enough to occupy the attention of the whole Christian world. Alexander III in 1175, and Innocent III in 1215, explicitly recalled the example of Gregory the Great, solemnly cursed the proprietary monk, and decreed that not even a formal papal dispensation could absolve him from obedience to this clause of his Rule. Yet the papal commissioners who visited Westminster Abbey in

1232 found that the obedientiaries were treating as private property whatsoever balance they could save from their yearly revenue; and the monk Flete, in his chronicle of the Abbey, bears testimony to this. The same visitation showed that the monks had chests of their own, contrary to St Benedict's specific commands, and that all were regularly receiving clothes-money; for, by a natural extension, the proprietary spirit of the *obedientiarii* had spread to the *claustrales*. The Rule granted the monk a yearly change of clothes; and many had got into the habit of exchanging this privilege for its equivalent in hard cash. This was one of the abuses formally condemned by Gregory IX in his great reforming statutes of 1239, and again by Innocent IV in 1245; but the next great papal reformer of the monasteries, Benedict XII, in 1337 and the following years, was compelled to repeat the prohibition, yet with no more effect. Indeed, the later Middle Ages saw the abuse not only extended but regularised. By that time, we find not only that the monks received both clothes-money and new clothes, but that they claimed this as their legal right; and here, indeed, they had solid support from the Benedictine General Chapter of England, which in 1340, when the ink was scarcely dry on Benedict XII's decree, openly contested the Pope's wisdom and set itself to whittle the prohibition away. Presently, therefore, visitatorial records abound with this paradox, that the *claustrales* actually appeal to their Visitor to compel the head of the house to violate the Rule with all its triple reinforcement of papal injunctions; and, what is more, that the Visitor accedes to their revolutionary demands.

Nor was this clothes-money the only excuse. As early as 1258, Westminster monks were being paid individually for their eucharistic services; a founder would leave a specific sum to the brother who was to say his particular memorial Mass. This custom becomes more and more frequent as time goes on; presently it invades even the Friars, whose reform had originally been a conscious revolt from this and similar Benedictine practices. At anniversaries, again, we presently find both monks and friars enjoying each his own personal share in the yearly distribution of money. The surviving account-rolls of Durham, Worcester, and other great monasteries show

that every monk had very considerable pocket-money, quite apart from the meat and drink which he was able to carry off from the refectory to his friends. In the nunneries, for reasons too long to explain here, the proprietary system had grown to far greater proportions; on the Continent, at any rate, there were many nunneries where each inmate had her own separate household and income.

Yet, all this time, disciplinarians were steadily insisting that this abuse cut at the root of the *tria substantialia*, and that every fault became possible in a monastery when private property was permitted. Johann Busch, that great German Visitor of the mid-fifteenth century whose writings supply almost a complete monastic history for his own time and province, insists emphatically on this point. So, again, does Gui Jouenneaux of half a century later, in his answer to those who opposed the reforms of Chezal-Benoit. The relaxed party, it is true, found a specious excuse in that vague discretionary power which St Benedict grants to his Abbots. If, they argued, the Abbot knows that the monks A, B, C possess X, Y, Z properties, then this implies at least his tacit consent; and, provided that A, B, or C would be ready at any moment to abandon their little belongings at their superior's command, we cannot condemn them as 'proprietary'; they do not possess these things; they simply use them by the Abbot's permission. In answer to this, the disciplinarians had no difficulty in showing that St Benedict had obviously not intended to abrogate his own commands altogether, under cover of this abbatial dispensing power; and that, as a matter of everyday experience, A and B and C were not found ready to abandon their pocket-moneys at any superior's call. Therefore these long-standing customs upon which the violators relied were simply vested abuses; they could not be called monastic *consuetudines* in any true sense, but rather *corruptelæ*. Some excuse there might be made for the Abbot's dispensation; but it could not altogether stand against these Papal prohibitions. The strict party had all reason on their side, but the relaxed party had all the votes; and even in Tudor England—far more emphatically in many parts of the Continent—it may be said that St Benedict's prohibition had practi-

cally broken down. Moreover, relaxation had already become semi-official; an Abbot who insisted upon following the Rule might now be corrected by an even higher official, the episcopal or capitulary Visitor, who might (and in fact, evidently did often) ignore the strict law.

Even more official was the final repudiation of a prohibition which St Benedict had issued in still more memorable terms. The 66th chapter of the Rule runs:

'If possible, let the monastery be so arranged that all the necessities, to wit, water, a mill, a garden, a bakehouse, or different offices shall be conducted within the precincts, in order that the monks be not compelled to wander outside; for that is altogether inexpedient to their souls. Now We will that this Rule be frequently read in congregation, lest any monk excuse himself on the plea of ignorance.'

No other chapter of the Rule ends with this emphatic warning; an emphasis which must have impressed the hearer even though it was probably accidental. It seems plain that the 66th was the last chapter of the original rule, and that this warning against forgetfulness or neglect was intended to apply not only for this matter of claustration but for all the preceding sixty-five chapters also; the remaining seven chapters, as scholars have shown with practical certainty, were added by St Benedict at other times. Yet, whether thus by accident or intentionally, it is to this 66th chapter that the warning is appended; and therefore, however adventitiously, the rule of strict claustration is brought into special prominence. Here again, circumstances first broke through the Rule and then thrust it almost into oblivion. The Abbot-baron could not even pretend to keep it; and, as the Abbey itself became quasi-baronial, neither could the obedientiaries. The Cluniacs were a reformed Order; for generations they stood out as a beacon on the monastic hill; yet their vast possessions placed them among the foremost business-men of their day; and we have only to glance at their methods as described in detail by Miss Rose Graham, to realise why Abbot Philippe de Harvenegt, at the end of the twelfth century, complained that monks could be found on every road and in every market-place. A century later, in a special bull, Boniface VIII set himself to re-enact the strict claustration of nuns; but

he made no attempt to recall the monks to their Rule. Indeed, a subtle distinction was invented, or rather, was dug out from Canon Law, to soften this anomaly. The nun was the Bride of Christ; therefore, she was in an exceptional position; for the monk's vow was never interpreted in those terms of conjugal metaphor. Hence, argues a Benedictine disciplinarian, just as we should be shocked to see even an earthly princess haggling in the market or mingling among common crowds, far more reason have we to be shocked at such behaviour on the part of the Bride of God. Boniface's bull remained almost a dead letter; we find nuns openly repudiating it to their Visitor's face; but that tacit distinction which it officially draws between female Benedictines who must keep the Rule, and males, who need not, is of the greatest historical significance.

While a Pope could thus tacitly ignore the 66th chapter of the Rule, Visitors complained repeatedly but vainly of the *evagationes monachorum*, sometimes explicitly connected with tavern-haunting in the town. It had become so regular an irregularity to neglect the Rule in its brutal strictness, that the line could no longer be drawn between permissible and reprehensible outgoings. A few years before Boniface's bull, we find an Archbishop of York formally refusing to recognise a Benedictine General Chapter decree which attempted to revive the rule of claustration. Five generations later, the General Chapter itself gave up all pretence; it treated claustration no longer as the rule, but as a very exceptional punishment. It decreed, in 1444, that the monk who said to his brother 'thou liest'—*mentiris*—should be gated for three weeks; and that he who struck with his fist or knife should not be permitted to leave the precincts for a whole year! Some modern writers have even emphasised this paradox by their incautious pleas in defence. It has been insisted that, when Thomas Cromwell issued his injunctions shortly before the Dissolution, we may read his wicked intentions in the clause which prescribed strict claustration; he knew (it is argued) the impossibility of this, and was simply seeking an occasion for condemning unsuspecting innocents who were certain to transgress a restriction so unreasonable and so capricious. Now, Cromwell was an astute and unscrupulous man;

and it is perfectly possible that he did count pretty confidently upon the monks' regular repudiation of Chapter 66, in spite of the fact that its maintenance would be so obviously favourable to ordinary regularity of monastic life. But, in that case, what more explicit testimony could we have for the distance to which these Tudor monks had drifted, in one most important disciplinary matter, from their first ideal?

If space permitted, I could give very similar evidence for the abandonment of other important restrictions, not only generally, as testified by Visitors' reports, but semi-officially or even officially in the General Chapter resolutions. For instance, it was a necessary matter, not only in common sense but by frequent decree, that accounts of revenue and expense should be regularly kept. Yet, of the seventy houses in Lincoln diocese for which we have visitors' reports in the mid-fifteenth century, we find that forty-five had no accounts to present, and some had not done so for years. The visitations of Norwich diocese, on the verge of the Reformation, present much the same evidence. Again, the prohibition of costly cloth and fashionable furs for monastic dress was equally ineffective. Almsgiving and hospitality were very generally neglected; in some cases we find that the monks kept back more than half, or even more than nine-tenths, of the moneys which had never been in any sense their own, and of which they were only trustees for the poor. Nobody has yet produced any English case from the two or three centuries before the Dissolution in which more than 10 per cent of the monks' net income went, by any channel whatever, to those whom we should call the real poor. For education, the Friars did much in the early days at the Universities, and were busy teachers and students there to the end. But the older Orders seldom taught or studied there; their record is anything but brilliant; and, in the matter of elementary and secondary schools, as in that of alms, they did not always fulfil their duty even as trustees. As early as 1250, the Archbishop of Rouen found it necessary to provide for monks who could not even read the Latin of their own Rule; and similar evidence can be continued down to the Reformation. The rule of manual labour was semi-officially abrogated at a very early date; the legend that monks

built their own monasteries, except under the most exceptional missionary conditions, is one of the most demonstrably false in all history; and even in writing and illumination they can be proved not to have done a tenth part of what is generally supposed. The Oxford Chancellor Gascoigne said no more than literal truth, about 1450, when he complained that the monks were destroying more books than they were making. All these things are written quite plainly in monastic records themselves; he who runs may read. But read we must, if we are to mark and learn and inwardly digest. That golden age is past in which an ecclesiastical historian could write like Agnellus, Bishop of Ravenna, who confesses that he found neither documentary nor oral evidence for some of his predecessors, but that he has written their lives none the less courageously, 'with the help of God and the prayers of the brethren.'*

Hitherto I have insisted upon the negative side of medieval monasticism. It is true that brighter pictures might be selected from the Continent; for the English story is drab in comparison with the glaring contrasts of light and shade elsewhere. On the one hand, we had no houses in which the monks finally married neighbouring nuns and set up a sort of feudal community; neither, on the other, had we any which had gone back to the earliest models of self-denial and beneficence. We did but strike an average between the best and the worst houses abroad; or, rather, something a little higher than that average. Therefore, historical truth demands insistence on this negative side; otherwise we cannot understand either the Reformation or our own modern world. We must emphatically oppose Carlyle's 'Everlasting No' to the too frequent assertion that piety and charity received a deadly blow at the fall of the monasteries.

Yet many of us regard the Reformation not only negatively but positively: from the 'Everlasting No' we pass on to the Everlasting Yes. Let me try to explain how I seem to see, behind all the blunders and weaknesses and even crimes of the Reformers, not only the plea that other men would have done the same in that position, not only the *tu quoque* that a still more

* Hodgkin, 'Italy and her Invaders,' vol. i, 1880, p. 446.

painful catalogue of human frailties might be drawn up from pre-Reformation times, but also a true forward stage for humanity, a true approach to that new heaven and new earth of the Apocalypse ; some reality in those words : ' The Spirit and the Bride say *Come*.' When we are told that the world may indeed have gained other things but it has lost faith, then I feel that the faith thus conceived is not the faith of Christ and His Apostles ; not the faith which forgets those things which are behind and reaches forth unto those things which are before. I am convinced that the average modern Englishman has, on the whole, a truer and nobler conception of God than his ancestor of four centuries ago. But nothing is harder to estimate than what a man really believes ; and you will not expect me to enter upon that complicated question here. Therefore, let us take a field more definitely historical ; let us ask ourselves why England, after the wreck of so many things and after a whole generation of sickening unrest, suddenly burst out into an unexampled richness of intellectual life.

It has been laid to the charge of the Reformation that, whereas there were 108 degrees taken at Oxford in 1535, the number sank after the fall of the monasteries to 33, and rose again under Mary to 70. But the Editors of the ' Cambridge History of English Literature,' while permitting the late Monsignor Benson to emphasise this, unfortunately neglected to demand that he should complete his obviously unfinished series ; that he should take his statistics one stage farther and show his readers how the numbers leapt up again when England had settled down. At Cambridge, whereas only 28 graduated in 1558, in 1570 there were 114, and 277 in 1583 ; that is, far beyond the highest pre-Reformation numbers. This, however, was only one side of the Elizabethan revival ; much more remains behind. That revolt, of which the Dissolution was one main feature, broke down certain barriers, and liberated certain forces, which created in effect a new world. Fresh combinations became possible, which brought us forward no longer in arithmetical but in geometrical progression ; the new differed from the old not merely in degree but in quality ; it was like Browning's musician who, out of three sounds, makes not a fourth sound but a star.

The Latin language, which began as the main educator of the Middle Ages, had for some time threatened to become rather an incubus. In the fourth century, its use was still testifying to the popular and congregational character of the earliest Church services ; but by 1500 A.D., in a world that had changed almost beyond recognition, this language testified rather to the separation of priest and flock. Johann Busch, a man of great tolerance and common sense, felt it scandalous that nuns should be allowed to possess service books in the vernacular ; and few more solemn historical mis-statements have ever been made than that which will be found in the Preface to the latest edition of the Roman 'Indice dei Libri Proibiti' published a few months ago, that the early vernacular Bible versions were approved by the Church. Not only in theology, but in other subjects also, translators of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries show themselves painfully aware of the attacks which will be made upon them for casting pearls before swine. Read John Trevisa's self-defence for presuming, in Chaucer's day, to translate Higden's 'Chronicle' into vulgar English,* side by side with Erasmus's triumphant claim that the Bible is for all men and for all women ; for the husbandman to chant at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and for the traveller to beguile the weariness of the way ; and then, in the light of these pleas, consider the effect of Henry VIII's final decree that a great Bible should be set up publicly in every church ; where, as we know, folk hung upon the lips of any layman who could read it aloud. For then, at last, after an iron-bound frost of more than a thousand years, men of all sorts had free access to one of the most wonderful collections of legend and history and poetry and piety and rhetoric that the world has ever seen. When every account has been taken of such Bible knowledge as ordinary medieval folk might manage to pick up from other sources, this revolution was still immense. Imagine a generation in which even the educated, apart from a few special students, knew no more of Shakespeare than Lamb's 'Tales,' followed by another generation in which the whole plays were suddenly revealed ; and you will still have only a pale analogy. The nation came

* 'Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk,' in A. W. Pollard, '15th Century Prose and Verse,' p. 203.

suddenly into a marvellous inheritance. 'Yes,' some men will answer; 'they broke in and spoiled it. Private judgment ran riot, from that time forward Europe has lost its age-long unity and universality of culture, based upon a single learned language current everywhere.' Here again, therefore, we must repeat the 'Everlasting No' before we can pass on to the Everlasting Yes.

I have heard a very high authority assert publicly that the unity of the Church, and this one Latin language, saved the Middle Ages from the curse of nationalism. But the actual fact is that nationalism began to appear as soon as nations began to take real form. One of the first steps of the new-born University of Paris, in the twelfth century, was to divide its students into nations, just as Bologna University separated them at perhaps an earlier date. At Oxford, nationalism was none the less baneful for dividing the Englishman not from the Continent, but from his fellow-Englishman born north or south of the Trent, or from the citizens of Oxford itself. Dr Rashdall was probably right in surmising that there may be no single yard of its High Street which has not at some time run with a student's blood. The Universal Church and the Universal Latin had scarcely more to do with ending the Hundred Years' War, or the lamentable conflicts which desolated Italy and Germany, than with kindling those conflagrations. For, to begin with, this Latin itself was seldom such as it may now appear through a haze of distance and exaggeration. Medieval Latin has often been unjustly and ignorantly despised; but, on the other hand, we may very easily overvalue it. No doubt we may get brilliant effects by choosing two or three hundred pages from a thousand years of literature, and by heightening these, as an able and enthusiastic translator will, with all the resources of modern sophistication; many excellent wines are habitually brandied for exportation. But it can scarcely be denied that, in poetry, the young vernacular languages had caught Latin up by the middle of the thirteenth century; and thenceforward they left it hopelessly behind.

The best chroniclers, again, gradually deserted Latin; and in philosophy it produced less and less of truly original work. Nor did it contribute to monastic culture all that has been claimed for it. Often, the Benedictine Rule

needed to be translated for Latinless monks ; and similar evidence might be quoted all through the Middle Ages, down to the days when it was thought worth while to turn even the monastic cartularies of Oseney and Godstow into English. Too often, therefore, those who kept the key of knowledge entered not in themselves ; and even those who entered seldom made it their real home. Think how few are the people, with every modern advantage, who ever arrive at real mastery of any other language than their own. Recall any conversation we have heard between highly educated people of different nationalities, and remember how far these were from expressing themselves with perfect ease. And then consider how seldom it would have been possible, even among the picked students of the Middle Ages, to find half a dozen sitting round the fire and discoursing, with anything like modern accuracy and suppleness on the speaker's part, or anything like the same ready uptake from his hearers, on the deepest problems of life and death. Did even More and Colet and Erasmus enjoy complete present-day liberty of intercourse ? Their philosophical concepts were in Latin ; emotionally they thought in the vernacular ; therefore, academic thought and common life could never fertilise each other with absolute freedom ; and this estrangement was disadvantageous to both.

It is true that the Renaissance had already begun to effect some real synthesis of academic and popular thought ; but the Reformation not only precipitated this movement, it contributed also a different factor, and perhaps even a controlling factor. A secularist sent me lately an article in which he argues that Luther was the man who ruined the modern world, not by destroying religion, but, on the contrary, by giving a fresh lease of life to dying Christianity ; by galvanising, for a few centuries, that which would have been quietly extinguished by the Renaissance with its steady advance of reason. This, from the writer's point of view, was a great calamity, just as Gibbon treats the rise of Christianity as the earliest and most fatal of all barbarian invasions ; as a delusion which could inspire Tertullian's boast that the Christian mechanic will give a ready answer to problems which had baffled the wisest of the philosophers. In both these criticisms we may find, perhaps,

the same one-sided truth; but we may answer that humanity can scarcely fail to gain, in the long run, from anything that compels men to look seriously outside themselves, and to mingle emotion with reason in their view of life. This is what the Reformation did; and, here in England, its partnership with the Renaissance kindled a flame to which neither, by itself, could have attained. The nearest precedent in time comes from fourteenth-century Italy. St Thomas Aquinas, so Professor Gilson has recently contended, was really the first man of the Renaissance, in virtue of his Aristotelian studies. Burckhardt, again, names Dante as the first. In both cases we may feel reservations; but one thing seems indisputable, that Dante could not have done anything like what he did, but for the rationalism which his age had inherited from the Schoolmen and the emotion which had been kindled by the Friars. Those two currents met and fused not only in Dante, but in Petrarch and Boccaccio also, and in a whole host of less-known Italians, and through them in Chaucer, whose Italian debts are scarcely realised to the full even nowadays. France, which hitherto had been undisputed queen in vernacular literature, and in whose tongue Dante's own master, Brunetto Latini, had written to the deliberate exclusion of his own, was suddenly left far behind. So again with our Elizabethan period. After Chaucer had passed away, we stood definitely below France; most of our best works were translations or adaptations from the French or Italians, until things had settled down after the Reformation. Then, while intellect, through the doors of the learned languages, was penetrating far more directly into ancient thought than any but the rarest students had done in the Middle Ages, emotion was again wrought up to something like Tertullian's pitch. For the English mechanic had access now to the vernacular Bible: moreover, twice a week at least, during Sunday matins and evensong, he followed the ancient liturgies in a vernacular which borrowed its force and grace directly from the Latin; and these proved a greater treasure to our nation than any that Drake brought home from the Indies. We may couple these two things advisedly; for both were parts of one vast and sudden movement of expansion. Erasmus's exultation at the spread of the

Bible is equalled by Samuel Daniel's prophecy in 1601, of the greatness that awaits our English tongue through the colonisation of America ; words which were quoted by Sir Walter Raleigh in one of his most memorable utterances :

' And who, in time, knows whither we may vent
 The treasure of our tongue ? To what strange shores
 This gain of our best story shall be sent
 To enrich unknowing nations with our stores ?
 What worlds in th' yet unformèd Occident
 May come refin'd with the accents that are ours ? '

Ideally, English might doubtless have attained to this Latin universality if Drake had never singed the King of Spain's beard ; and, ideally, we might have freed ourselves in quite other ways from a Latin domination which, for some generations past, had operated rather to choke than to stimulate English philosophy and literature. Yet, in fact, the liberation in both fields was brought about in the same clumsy but effectual fashion. We may stigmatise as buccaneers the men who actually plundered our abbeys ; but, incidentally, they did the same work as Drake's buccaneers.

Of the Reformation struggle, we may say what has been said of the Great War ; it was an heroic episode, when all deductions have been made ; but, when we look around us to find the hero, we can ' point to nothing but a mob.' In Tudor England, common people had gradually convinced themselves that the uncommon people were blundering on in the wrong direction ; yet uncommon people were immovable ; they protested that nothing but force should shift them ; and the common people took them at their word, staking their own lives on the issue. The evidence seems to show that the Tudor monasteries were in very much the same condition as our eighteenth-century colleges. And if the monks of Magdalen, like the monks of Glastonbury, had been able to say ' nothing short of a revolution can move us,' then Magdalen also would have been swept away, and modern antiquaries would amuse us with spirit-rapping messages concerning the vanished buildings. We have here that which the Utopians in their day, and Mr Bertrand Russell in ours, have looked upon as the most justified form of

warfare; when one side is cumbering the ground, and the other fights for newer and wider cultivation. There was true enthusiasm on both sides; enthusiasm for religious ideas, for class ideas, for national ideas. On both sides, again, there were greed and selfishness; for, in all these struggles, religion and politics were inextricably intermingled.* When Paul III condemned to slavery all Englishmen who should support Henry VIII against him, and when Pius V gave over Elizabeth and all her subjects to a foreign conqueror's mercy, they did this in the name of God Almighty. On the other hand, when the English sailors poured their broadsides into the Spaniards off Pantellaria, this again was in the mood of Elijah face to face with the priests of Baal. The English gunnery was rapid and accurate. 'Our men,' writes one of them, 'ceased not in the midst of their business to make prayer to Almighty God . . . to teach their hands to war and their fingers to fight. . . .' Contrarily, the foolish Spaniards cried out, according to their manner, not to God, but to our Lady (as they term the Virgin Mary), saying: 'O Lady, help! O blessed Lady, give us the victory, and the honour thereof shall be thine!' † Some modern readers may mock at one side in this fight, and some may mock at both; yet, when we have taken full account of all, there is nothing to prevent us from looking upon this struggle just as St Augustine looked upon the wars of Rome; no party was blameless, but, on the whole, the fittest survived; we have here an Ordeal of Battle and a Judgment of God in the medieval sense.

This, then, as I have said, comes out in literature. Look at the book in which Bishop Pecock, under Henry VI, attempted to argue philosophically with the Lollards in their own vernacular; it is pitiful to see how he flounders in his English; you would scarcely believe that 150 years could bring us forward from this shapeless confusion to Hooker's mastery of thought and language on very similar subjects. Compare, again, the 'Dialogues' and 'Apology' of a very great man, Sir Thomas More, with Bacon's 'Essays' of two generations later. Is

* See, for instance, Professor A. O. Meyer's 'England and the Later Church under Elizabeth,' p. 162 and *passim*. 'Religion and Politics,' he writes, 'were inseparable.'

† Hakluyt, 'Navigations, etc.' (Glasgow, 1904), vol. vi, p. 54.

there any other great country in which the gulf between old prose and new is so wide as that? Moreover, this comes out even more plainly when we turn from prose to poetry. If it was our gentlefolk's imitations of the Italian lyrics which transformed England into 'a nest of singing-birds,' no such explanation can be offered for that outburst of dramatic power which stands unrivalled since the days of Greece. By Elizabeth's time, men had read the Latin classics again with free and unacademic eyes. Moreover, some of the greatest classics were accessible in English also; it was Shakespeare's contemporary, Philemon Holland, of whom a jealous brother-author wrote:

'Holland with his translations doth so fill us,
He will not let Suetonius be Tranquillus!'

And, side by side with all this new material, we now had a new literary idol, raised upon such a pedestal as that on which the old Greeks had placed Homer. For church and castle and city and cottage possessed now, as plain and ubiquitous as any medieval shrine or image, the most dramatic of all single books in the world, the Bible. To realise the effect of all this on our highest English literature we need not wait for Shakespeare; we can mark it already in Marlowe; for instance, in that last speech of Faustus, concerning which Scott remarked that its magnificence seemed to have discouraged Goethe from attempting any such ending to his own play. Notice how naturally Marlowe quotes in the same breath from Ovid's 'Amores' and from Bible mysticism; and how this new combination gives redoubled force to each:

'Oh, Faustus!

Now hast thou but one bare hour to live,
And then thou must be damn'd perpetually.
Stand still, you ever-moving spheres of heav'n,
That time may cease, and midnight never come. . . .
O lente lente currite noctis equi!

The stars move still, time runs, the clock will strike,
The devil will come, and Faustus must be damned.

Oh I'll leap up to heav'n!—who pulls me down?
See where Christ's blood streams in the firmament!
One drop of blood will save me: oh, my Christ!
—Rend not my heart for naming of my Christ;
Yet will I call on him!'

There is nothing quite like that even in Dante ; and, if Shakespeare surpassed it, that was not in intensity but in breadth. For Shakespeare was born into a world which permitted a universality beyond the more formal universality of medieval language and thought ; into a world which permitted that heaven-born universality of free choice proclaimed by Emerson : ' What Plato has thought, he may think ; what a saint has felt, he may feel.' Far too much has been made of Dante's so-called universality. To begin with, part of what it is fashionable to label thus simply represents his debt to the Latin classics, and, through them, to that universal heritage of ancient thought from which his master Virgil drew. When the modern critic singles out in Dante this or that feature as *universal*, it might often be more intelligible, and, I think, truer to fact, if we characterised it as *classical*. Again, we need to discount the plea that Dante's framework of thought is one which was universally acknowledged throughout Latin Christianity in his day. To begin with, the uniformity of medieval thought is often greatly exaggerated. And, even if this so-called uniformity were complete, that would render Dante rather provincial than universal, when we contemplate all world-literature throughout the ages. It would render him universal in no stricter sense than contemporary Chinamen were ' universal ' in embodying all Chinese thought of their own time. The ' Inferno ' is magnificent less in virtue of its dogmatic theology than in spite of it ; it owes more of its poetry to Virgil's Sixth Aeneid than to St Thomas Aquinas. Again, some of the most remarkable touches in the whole ' Commedia ' are among the least theologically correct ; for instance, the Great Refusal, the final salvation of Manfred even from that stem blasted by excommunication, the beatification of Ripheus and Siger de Brabant and Joachim of Fiore. Shakespeare is not comparable to Dante in strict symmetry of form ; but in subject-matter he has inherited a new and far wider world ; he has escaped from the provincialism of a thousand years. To many of us, he seems a Protestant of the Protestants ; yet he grasps so firmly so much of what was best in the Middle Ages, that it has been possible for enthusiastic Roman Catholics to claim him for their own.

There, then, is the constructive side of the Reformation. Virtue is now no longer cloistered and fugitive. Literature is no longer overshadowed by the great church walls, or checked by monastic and quasi-monastic limitations. The reformer's motto is: 'Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free'; the student's is: 'What Plato has thought, you may think,' and no longer 'What Plato has thought, you may think only so far as your priest or your bishop permits.' If that 'stand fast' be answered with: 'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall'; if any man reminds us here of Lord Acton's warning that liberty is not a heritage to be put into the bank, and to feed us with a breed of barren metal, but rather a thing painful and dangerous, which must be guarded with no less risk and labour than what first won it; if again, we are told that a strict and solemn account awaits any generation which may abandon any precious heritage of the past, then I hope we shall all cheerfully assent. We value the privilege of modern life so highly that we are willing to accept its heaviest responsibilities and its widest commitments. From one side men are crying to us that Europe can be saved only by a reversion to medieval thought and belief. Others, from the opposite side, insist that all Christianity has been a bad dream; and that for sweetness and sanity we must go back to Paganism. Both these contentions, we are convinced, are fundamentally unhistorical; there never was a golden age behind; even less in paganism than in medievalism; the brave man's task is to seek his Eldorado forwards and onwards, and, thus seeking it, to create it.

G. G. COULTON.

Art. 9.—EDMUND GOSSE.

The Life and Letters of Sir Edmund Gosse. By The Hon. Evan Charteris, K.C. London: Heinemann, 1931.

WHEN Edmund Gosse died in 1928, in his eightieth year, he had troops of friends. Nine years earlier, on his seventieth birthday, two hundred of them had united to pay him homage. On that occasion Mr Balfour, as he then was, addressing an assembly that under Lord Crewe's presidency was representative of English literature, art, and public life, said: 'Mr Gosse has a double claim on our regard . . . the claim of friendship . . . and the wider claim to public admiration.' They were simple words, but they met the case. Gosse was, indeed, being honoured in this dual sense; by his friends, who gradated in age from Thomas Hardy, born in 1840, to Robert Graves, born in 1897, as a man peculiarly fitted to inspire a public celebration of friendship; and by the profession of letters as a writer who for more than half a century had devoted himself with high and steady distinction to their calling. In the nine years that remained to him Gosse fell into no decline of intellectual energy or social zest, and he died in a private and public esteem even more firmly fixed than it had been when, in acknowledging the tribute of 1919, he had written: 'I pore over your warm words and re-study the list of admired and beloved names, until I ask myself Can all this indulgence and affection possibly be meant for *me* ?'

It is certain, then, that no biography of our time can have been awaited with greater personal interest, or a more critical solicitude, than Mr Charteris's 'Life.' A considerable proportion of the living men and women who in this country have established their names in the literature of their time were themselves on intimate terms with Gosse; and so Mr Charteris has had to submit his work to the scrutiny of opinion in many cases at once expert in the craft of literary presentation and as well-informed on the immediate subject as he. He has survived this searching ordeal with entire credit. In the chorus of praise with which his work has been welcomed, there seems to have been no discordant voice. He has satisfied obligations of the most delicate kind with a tact and unforced skill that would have delighted Gosse himself. An insensitive or

inadequate memoir of this eager, complex, and in many respects elusive personality would have been something of a disaster to the annals of an age, and there is no one among Gosse's friends but must rejoice with Mr Charteris in his triumph, for it is no less.

With so great a mass of material at his disposal, Mr Charteris must have experienced much anxiety in considering the design of his book. He decided on a method that was simple and lucid. Simple, that is to say, in effect; its employment needed rare discrimination. Gosse was an inveterate letter-writer, and his biographer, with notable self-restraint, has allowed him for the most part to tell his own story through his correspondence. Though correspondence is here an inexact term, since while we have a generous harvest of letters written by Gosse, we have, apart from a few early family documents, none written to him. It must not be inferred that Mr Charteris has been over-prudent in his responsibilities. Within his chosen design, he has supplied all the exposition that was necessary. Particularly in his account of Gosse's childhood and early years, before the letters make much beyond domestic contacts, he shows how readily and shrewdly he can answer any calls upon his own observation and sympathy. One slight note will indicate the alertness of his perceptions. Speaking of Gosse at the outset of his career, he says: 'his movements were quick, and he trod lightly, with his weight on the forward part of his feet. This resulted in a gait curiously suggestive at once of eagerness and caution.' That is perfectly seen, and it was as true of Gosse at seventy as it was at twenty.

As time goes on, however, and Gosse's life becomes enriched in all directions, Mr Charteris leaves him more and more to himself. The method is wholly justified in its results, but it is one that emphasises a feature of biographical writing that must perplex every one who undertakes it. When all has been said that is possible within reasonable proportion, there remains as much, indeed more, of no less significance unsaid. Mr Charteris has given us a convincing portrait of Gosse, even, it may be allowed, a sufficient portrait. No one can fail to recognise its truth, its charm, and its insight. And yet, among the friends who will regard it with unreserved satisfaction, there will inevitably be many who will recall other aspects

of the familiar figure, and circumstances that enliven or elaborate the aspect here given. These will be tempted to amplify a record in which there is nothing to correct. They will add footnotes of their own to Mr Charteris's admirable pages, as two or three of them have already done.

In 1909 I sent Gosse an early book of my verse. It received a civil little note of acknowledgment, which was as much as it deserved. It was not until 1913 that the acquaintance began to ripen into a friendship that Gosse invested with generosity until the time of his death. In that year I sent him a book I had written on Swinburne. Although I was then thirty, I had begun late as a writer, and was still painfully immature. The most that could be claimed for the study was enthusiasm and a certain interest as displaying the fumbings of a mind that with a most precarious education was yet absorbed in the nature and tentative practice of poetry. I had only recently come to know anybody who knew anything, and I certainly then could scarcely pretend to know Gosse—though no doubt I pretended it. Further, it was more than commonly brazen to ask his attention for a neophytic book on a subject that was pre-eminently his own. I could not have complained had I been advised politely to keep off the grass. To my astonishment I was told: 'it is the soundest and sweetest estimate of this poet that has yet been published.' But that was not all. There followed in the 'Morning Post' a signed review that was handsome without reserve. It was the kind of thing that a young writer never forgets. Thereafter I saw Gosse at frequent intervals, and I have been refreshing my memories of him by re-reading some hundred and forty letters, the last of which he wrote in the year before his death. The following notes are taken from these in chronological order.

When writing the Swinburne book, I had been to see Watts-Dunton, who was not only helpful to me, but spoke of Gosse in terms that seemed to belie the rumours of an antagonism that are confirmed by Mr Charteris. On April 8, 1913, Gosse wrote: 'What you tell me as to Mr Watts-Dunton's communication with you is most agreeable to me to hear. . . . What you so amiably repeat is the first sign of a return to friendly relations, which (now I know of it) I shall hope to be able to cultivate, for I desire

nothing less than to be at enmity with the poor old man.' Nothing seems to have come of it, but Mr Charteris's remark that 'it was the rarest thing for him to miss a chance of reconciliation' has here a note of confirmation. In June of the same year: 'Here is the picture. It looks to me like a German fiddler in the orchestra of a second-rate theatre! But we are as God and the artists make us.' In 1913 Lascelles Abercrombie, Rupert Brooke, Wilfrid Gibson and I began the publication of 'New Numbers,' a quarterly containing our new poems.

21.12.13 ' . . . I subscribed for two copies of your "Poems by Four," with a foolish letter to the four of you which (with the cruel candour of the young!) you left unacknowledged! The Poet Laureate has been staying here with us on a little visit. We talked of you, and read some of your poems together.'

13.5.14 ' . . . this morning arrives "Noble Numbers 2," with your very beautiful poem "Love's House." How ingenious and amusing is Rupert Brooke's fish-hymn. I watch you all, silhouetted against the sunrise, from my frog-hole down below.'

Mr Charteris gives a charming account of the life-long ceremony that Gosse made of his hospitality. For many years it was his custom to give a little Christmas dinner at his club to the Prime Minister in office. His guests for the occasion were chosen to a fixed design. There must be one or two of the Minister's personal friends, one or two University professors, some junior member of the House to whom this chance of personal contact with his leader would be valuable, a young diplomat or so, and a young writer with a career to encourage—not more than eight or ten in all.

3.11.15 'First and foremost—the Prime Minister (with whom I dined last night) fixes Thursday Dec. 9 for his annual dinner with me. So please enter that date with a diamond pencil. . . .'

I remember that the dinner was an hour late, Mr Asquith being detained by a critical debate. Among the other guests were Walter Raleigh, C. J. Grierson, and Robert Vansittart, then better known as a poet than as a diplomat. I was exceedingly embarrassed, and no less thrilled, when Gosse told me that I was to sit next to the Prime Minister

at table. It was graciously apparent that the others were used to sitting next to a Prime Minister, and so now it was my turn. I was deeply impressed by Mr Asquith's capacity for momentarily discarding the burden of Europe that he then had on his shoulders. He talked about Gladstone and Horatio Bottomley and poetry. We agreed to decide independently which was the best lyric in the language, and found that we had both chosen 'Fear no more the heat o' the sun.'

A remarkable letter written by Gosse to me on Rupert Brooke's death, recounting a dream, has been printed by Mr Charteris, but some months later (3.11.15) he wrote again :

'I shall look forward very eagerly to your article on Rupert. It is desirable that his friends should record the truth, because already one of those odious "legends" which British sentimentality is always ready to form is being wound about his name. A little more and those who really loved and comprehended him will be elbowed out of court by those who never saw him or contemplated his real nature. Have you seen Eddie's Memoir? I think it admirable, almost superlatively admirable.'

28.12.15 'You are forbidden to send me a free copy of your Essay on Rupert Brooke. You will want every one of the 115. On the other hand, I hope you will be able to spare me the 2 copies I am hereby ordering.'

I was relieved when the essay met with approval.

I was able to arrange for an exhibition of Sylvia Gosse's drawings at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre, and my admiration for them seems to have found occasion also at a London show :

27.3.16 '... We hear that at Carfax this last week while the Duchess of Marlborough was unable to make up her mind between two of Sylvia's drawings, a gentleman elegantly forced her to decide by promptly buying one of her favourites. She bought the other at once, lest worse things should happen to her. The gentleman gave a name much beloved in this house.'

Gosse's encouragement was no matter of easy compliment. His praise though generous was critical, but he remembered his objections and was eager to note improvement. 'I think you want to study the value of *words* a

little more . . . some words you use (and all the other young poets too) as mere counters,' he wrote in a letter of 1915 quoted by Mr Charteris. This enhanced the welcome given to a new book two years later—'I find in it the only thing your poetry seemed to lack, a full sense of the preciousness of words—of the exact unhackneyed phrase. You are beautifully extending your vocabulary.' But his interest would sometimes go beyond praise altogether. The following speaks for itself:

27.10.16 'My dear John, The Macmillans are proposing to issue a 5th volume of their great anthology "The English Poets," dealing with poets who have died since 1880. The critical notices will be written, as before, by a variety of people, and already T. Hardy, Bridges, myself and other seniors are pledged. But I think it very important that your generation also should come in, and I have urged the editor, Mr T. Humphry Ward, to apply to you and Masefield. It is an enterprise with which it will do you good to be identified, for remember that you will be a fellow-contributor with Matthew Arnold, Swinburne and Pater, all of whom wrote for the earlier volumes. So, if Mr Ward writes to you, answer him with amenity and agreement. Remember, it is a little army, where every one must take the particular post assigned to him.

Ever yours,

EDMUND GOSSE.'

While I was engaged on this work, Gosse was solicitous in his help, lending me books, sending me references, and supplying me with likely scraps of information about my poets. It was all done with unfailing tact, in affectionate care that his protégé should do him credit. I think Wilde must have been one of the poets originally allotted to me—Mr Charteris prints a letter from Gosse to Dr Sim regretting his ultimate omission. I find in a postcard, 'How *stupid* about Wilde. The foolishness of Ward hath often left me weeping.'

At this time, too, Gosse proposed me for a fellowship of the Royal Society of Literature. He took the affairs of that body very seriously, and was constant in his attendance at its Councils. With two or three other distinguished men of letters, he exerted himself, with a considerable measure of success, to restore it to the dignity and importance from which it has fallen after its early years when Coleridge and Malthus had been among its Professors.

Election had become too easy, and the fellowship roll in later times had been silted up with nonentities. It is largely due to Gosse's vigilance that to-day admission has once more become an honour. He conveyed the pleasant news of my own at a time when I had been suffering from a succession of illnesses, and this is how he did it :

19.1.17 ' . . . Now I must hurry to another subject. The election to the R.S. of L. being once completed (it has to be made) I insist on being allowed to pay the original 5*l*. With all the expenses of your illness, it would never do to add this to them. When the time comes, I shall send you the little sum, which you shall pass on in your own cheque to the Secretary, and it shall be a secret for ever between you and me.'

Since I can no longer share the secret with him, he would absolve me for divulging a kindness so characteristic and so characteristically done. It was by his influence, too, that in 1919 I was elected to the Academic Committee. 'I congratulate you. You are by a good many years our youngest Academician.'

'It would be an error,' says Mr Charteris, 'to suppose that friendship with Gosse was always plain sailing.' No mind can ever have been more eager for wide contacts, and none more sensitive to the impressions that they made. A crowd of people in a room was not a crowd for him, but a number of individuals each one of whom was making an impact, friendly or antagonistic, upon his consciousness. Similarly, his closest friend could never afford to rest on the oars of intimacy. Gosse, splendidly loyal and generous in friendship, was exacting as to its obligations, its behaviour. Mr Charteris, again, puts it precisely: 'Giving so lavishly himself and importing into friendship such vehement activity of spirit, he was easily checked and far too ready to fancy slights.' However well-trying a friendship might be, the smallest negligence or discord would be noted, and probably challenged. 'He was incapable of letting things slide, or of chancing the probability that they would right themselves.' Fluctuations of temperature could even be indicated by forms of address; a brief correspondence might register its moods thus—'My dear John,' 'My dear Drinkwater,' 'Dear Drinkwater,' 'My dear John.'

I appear to have misbehaved myself only four times in twenty years. Two of the occasions, both of the same nature, made rather heavy going for a moment. Mr Charteris, with a full sense of Gosse's unique gifts as an expositor, adds: 'but he was not a fearless critic. . . . His business was to call attention to the idols, and much more rarely to idols in the making.' This must not be misunderstood. Gosse could be, and frequently was, liberal in his encouragement of young reputations, and until the end it was his constant anxiety not to grow insensitive to new voices. But he was shy of any talent that for some reason or another had made itself definitely unpopular. 'He would,' says Mr Charteris, 'never have been *contra mundum* from his "pulpit."'' My two squalls with him had their origins in my association with two such writers, once in the dedication of a book, and once as chairman at a public dinner. 'But I see on your fly-leaf, as your dedicatee, the name of a man whose existence is horrible to me. How *can* you? Forgive this tiresome lecture, but really . . .' and so on. I explained that I valued his friendship to the point of idolatry, to any point in fact short of allowing it to determine who my other friends were to be. At once he responded with all his rich magnanimity.

19.4.17 'My dear John [the former letter had been Drinkwater], It is impossible for me to regret having called forth from you the beautiful and even memorable letter which I have received this morning. I feel it a privilege to see the workings of your mind and conscience. . . .

I am always,

Yours affectionately [superseding Yours
sincerely],
EDMUND GOSSE.'

On the other occasion I was less successful in persuading him, though not in recovering his good graces.

Twice I provoked him on trifling matters, one merely humorous. In the bottom drawer of a bureau in his Hanover Terrace study, he kept a little store of bibliophilic treasures, and a visit was commonly celebrated by a gift from these. I find among my books such cherished souvenirs as his own rare edition of 'Love's Graduate' and his early pamphlet on Swinburne, the manuscript

of his essay on Lord Redesdale, Blaikie's own copy of 'Madrigals, Songs and Sonnets,' by John Arthur Blaikie and Edmund William Gosse, published in 1870, and a first edition of Maria Rossetti's 'Shadow of Dante,' all of them gracefully inscribed. Sometimes they would come by post.

3.11.15 ' . . . For some time past I have been keeping for you a copy of the first edition of Christina Rossetti's "Goblin Market." I may as well send it now. I think it one of the very most attractive editions principes of the Victorian age, and it is getting rare.'

But once a present came without the inscription, and I was bold to say that it was incomplete, with this result :

21.11.17 ' . . . I received the "Letters of Charlotte Brontë." You have got into the habit of always sending back any little book one sends you. [I had certainly never done so before.] You should break yourself of this disconcerting way. It vexes the donor, and needlessly gives him the trouble of a second package and the expense of a second postage. I shall keep the Brontë Letters by me until I have some other package to send you.'

The other minor engagement took place as late as 1926, when I was dining one evening alone with Gosse at his house. There had been some misunderstanding between him and a friend who was an even closer friend of mine. I had promised to see whether the difference could be composed. At what seemed a suitable moment I made a tentative approach. I was abashed by what was little less than an explosion—a vehemence, indeed, such as I had never known Gosse display before. I knew he was being unreasonable, partly on account of misinformation, and I stuck to my point. But he would have none of it. With a humble submission that he was wrong, I had to let the question drop. The next day he wrote :

23.3.26 ' . . . As I lay in bed I thought penitently of the exaggerated way in which I had been led to complain of ——. You must please forget all about it. There was something very ungenerous in my splenetic outburst. I am sure the poor man has worries enough to account for anything, and, after all, the world is wide enough to hold us both.'

At the end of 1917, I was sent on an odd and quite unheroic expedition to France. 'I think it an excellent

thing that you have undertaken it. . . . You must be sure to dress *warmly*: the cold in the north of France can be intense. . . . You are, I am quite sure, deepening and widening, in many ways, your impress on your generation, and this humane episode in France will further extend it.' In the following year I was contemplating my first visit to Thomas Hardy:

15.3.18 ' . . . I am truly glad that you are going to see T. Hardy. I shall write to him about you. Be sure and give him my love. I have been writing for the April No: of the "Edinburgh Review" a very long article—a regular analysis—of Hardy's lyrical poetry. I am very anxious to show it to you. I should rather like you to find out whether he would prefer—in due time—to see it *or not*. He is very odd in these respects. He knows it is being written.'

After the visit, came this comforting assurance:

14.4.18 'You will be interested to know that I hear, through neighbours of Hardy, that your visit gave him great pleasure. He hurried in to them to tell them what you had said, and what you looked like, and how much he had liked you.'

Praise from Gosse was a tonic, but those of us who enjoyed it knew how to guard ourselves against the dangers of self-esteem. It is true that he once remarked that like Washington he could not tell a lie, at least where literature was concerned, and Mr Guedalla got himself into trouble for saying that he would be proud if he could believe half that Gosse had written in a review. 'I always mean exactly the whole of what I write. I believe that you expressed yourself in haste, and not with a wish to wound me.' This was no more than serious jesting, but there is a hint of significance behind it. Mr Charteris quotes Gosse as observing of Lord Acton, who absurdly used Sophocles, Cervantes and Dante as a pedestal for George Eliot, 'It is very dangerous to write like that,' and then adds, 'It was one of his [Gosse's] merits that he never did write like that.' It is true, but he had a way, not in print, but in his letters, of pitching his approval very high on the scale of enthusiasm. In the letters printed by Mr Charteris, we find him writing to Browning as one whose name 'I reverence as the highest of living names': to Stevenson as 'the best essayist since Lamb': to Swinburne that 'no second light

has arisen in 27 years that has been to me what the lamp of your great passion for poetry has been': to Hardy as 'the man whom of all my living contemporaries I admire and delight in the most': to Pinero as being 'to the reign of Edward VII what Farquhar is to Queen Anne, and more too': to Compton Mackenzie as the author of 'far and away the best account of University life that ever was written': to J. C. Squire that 'the young prose of to-day is uniformly bad, except yours': to Siegfried Sassoon that a new work is 'full of the peculiar force in which you are alone in your generation': and to Lytton Strachey, 'You are the best writer living under fifty.' Discovering Saint Simon, he exclaims at the age of sixty-eight, 'Surely this book is more thrilling than any other in the world. Everything pales beside it.'

There is in none of these instances any question of insincerity. It merely was that when Gosse was liking a thing very much he was apt at the moment to like it to the exclusion of everything else, an amiable weakness at worst. And always it must be remembered that he was really incapable of liking anything that was tawdry or spurious. In certain cases, where his acute personal sensibility had in some way been jarred, he was apt to disregard meritable living writers altogether, but personal esteem could never secure his approval of poor work. Perhaps it would state the case more exactly to say that poor writing put his personal esteem out of the question. If, in praising work that he admired, he allowed personal esteem to wing his words with an extra feather or two, no harm was done and much innocent pleasure given. The integrity was unspoilt by the touch of extravagance. To be praised by Gosse was, as I said, a tonic, and it set you up. But a recognition of its nature saved you from saying too complacently 'What a fine fellow am I.'

'I wait, till, down the eastern sky,
Muses, like Mænads in a throng,
Sweep my decayed traditions by,
In startling tones of unknown song.

So to my day's extremity,
May I, in patience infinite,
Attend the beauty that must be,
And, though it slay me, welcome it.'

The complaint and the resolution were equally candid. His mind was, in fact, receptive till the end, but he experienced moods of genuine if serene exhaustion. In 1926 he wrote to Mr Squire, 'You are the last poet I shall ever admire. I have come to the end of my tether, and the younger bards bore me to extinction.' He was then seventy-seven, but already in 1918 I find a letter :

'... How are you, and what are you doing? I hear very little, except that new poets spring up on every side, Pindars in shoals, troops of Heines, beds of the spawn of Yeats—it is really dreadful. I shudder at the sight of the slender and elegant volumes of verse, all so clever and all so alike and all so empty. I think a law might be passed forbidding the publication of the work of any new poet. The bard should be made to give an affidavit that he had published something in book-form before (say) 1916. If he couldn't produce it—silence!'

Boredom and disillusion were, however, experiences of which, in fact, Gosse knew nothing. The pretence that he was discarded, out of tune with the times, neglected, was a humour on which he played with a sly and gentle irony, no more. Mr Charteris tells us how Mr Shaw, walking away with him from the Abbey after Hardy's funeral, at which they had both been pall-bearers, spoke with enthusiasm of 'Father and Son.' 'Oh, my dear Shaw,' said Gosse, 'you are the *only* one who ever encourages me.' Mr Shaw, it seems, was very becomingly taken in—'I was greatly pleased by this.' It was a familiar gesture, though by no means an empty one.

When the fancy was on him, he would speak to me of himself as 'Your poor old Uncle.' I had, perhaps, made an early Sunday afternoon arrival at Hanover Terrace. On his desk would be half a dozen books newly received from friendly or solicitous authors, a sheaf of invitations, assurances of European regard; and presently, one knew, up the stairs would come the discreetly marshalled procession of poets, diplomats, and personages, to pay court. But the talk took no account of these. 'My dear John—how kind you are to your poor old Uncle. Nobody else takes any notice of him. You are too indulgent—but he knows the truth—we must face it. You will wake one morning to read a notice in your "Times," "We regret to announce the death of Mr Edward Goose, a minor novelist of the Victorian era."'

Two of the best letters I received from Gosse were written in 1919 and 1923, after he had seen my plays 'Abraham Lincoln' and 'Robert E. Lee.' I wish I could print them here, since they reveal him perfectly as a play-goer, a friend, and a stylist. But this is a point at which modesty does forbid. Two other occasions of his interest supply my last gleanings from his letters. In 1922, at a time when I was in great personal perplexity, he wrote :

19.2.22 'My dear John, Ever since I saw you at the Savile for a moment, I have been harassed by a solicitude and I have hoped to hear from you and have your confidence. I gathered from your hurried words that you had some particular trouble or anxiety, which I was very hopeful to share and perhaps to alleviate. But I have heard no more, and now I am going away. . . . It makes me uneasy, and I regret that you have not come, as you always should, and told me the whole particulars. . . .'

And then :

5.7.22 'My dear John, Your little note makes me sad and anxious. But keep your heart up—all will be well. Come to me if I can be of the slightest use to you. . . .'

That was an aspect of Gosse that even his friends seldom saw, but it was constant in his nature.

Mr Charteris's readers will know about Parker, the maid at Hanover Terrace, who has a delightful page in his book, and Caruso the cat.

2.6.22 ' . . . The little photographs are charming. Parker is enchanted with the picture of herself waving an immense Caruso before the Lord.'

And, in conclusion, concerning Paddy, a tortoiseshell kitten :

27.5.26 'My dear John, We were not expecting you to send for Paddy quite so soon, and all my ladies are out. However, Parker thinks she is quite ready to leave us, being 6 weeks old to-morrow. She has been trained quite correctly. Only, about food, she will want a little care at first. I do hope you will like her, she is not quite so strong as her brother Sandiman (who has found a kind home with the Guedallas) but she is healthy and amiable.

With warmest greetings to you both,

I am ever yours,

EDMUND GOSSE.'

Gosse neither had nor pretended to have any clear-cut philosophic views about life. His intelligence was quick to every subtlety of men and books, and he was almost infallible in recording the impressions received. He loved poetry and the company of poets, and cared little for points of view. He was the appreciative friend of many political leaders in all parties, but I never heard him express the smallest interest in party politics, nor does any appear in Mr Charteris's book. In a letter to Stevenson, written in 1886, there is a confession remarkable in its self-knowledge:

'I do not know how it is that you and so many others . . . have a gift entirely denied to me, the gift of thought. If I can be said to think at all, it is flashingly, along the tip of the tongue or the pen; and when I hear people talk of a sustained exercise of thought, it is of a thing unknown to me. We learn to be very hypocritical about the attitude of our minds. If I am strenuously honest . . . when I am not working my mind is absolutely idle.'

One of the consequences was that while he was instantly critical of any defect in personality, behaviour, or style, he had small if any concern for abstract principles, and he indulged no moral indignations at large. In his contacts with his friends and literature he might know many anxieties, but when these were at rest it needed some very violent convulsion from the world without to disturb his composure. In these conditions, one aspect of his character becomes, in his own words already quoted, 'almost superlatively admirable.' Mr Charteris supplements in a most interesting way the picture of Gosse's early life already famous in 'Father and Son.' When Edmund was eighteen, he wrote a poem on Hope, which his father sent to a nonconformist editor asking him to print it. It did not appear. 'I had asked the Lord much,' Edmund was told, 'that if it were according to His will it might be inserted, but it is plainly not His Mind, and we must submit.' Many years later, in 1908, Gosse wrote to Lord Knutsford that his central intention in writing 'Father and Son' had been to expose 'the modern sentimentality which thinks it can parade all the prettiness of religion without really resigning its will and its thought to faith. You have most excellently said it is either my father's creed or nothing.'

In the same letter he adds : ' the old faith is now impossible to sincere and intelligent minds, and we must courageously face the difficulty of following entirely different ideals in moving towards the higher life.'

But in his youth there had been a severe and constant strain upon his genuine love for a father whose fanatical methodism was sustained by a conviction that the coming of the Lord was nigh, ' even at the door.' At the age of twenty-five, Edmund's exemplary filial respect was provoked to this : ' It is quite useless, I know, to appeal to you against such a letter as your last. What is gracious or courteous or sympathetic becomes absolutely nothing to you when you approach these topics.' With his natural instincts and gifts for literature, Edmund was bound to drift or march away from so blighting a code, but it is in the process of his emancipation that we find testimony to the moral excellence of which I speak. As a young man, while he was first refreshing himself in the air and light of poetry, he still for a time observed the example of his Plymouth brethren, teaching in a Sunday school and working for Dr Barnardo in the slums of London. But he soon found that he had neither heart nor ability for these pursuits, and abandoned them. Long before middle-age he had discarded for ever what he called ' the splendid metallic rigour ' that had been imposed upon his youth. The fine thing was that in rejecting its evils, he never forgot its comelier lessons. Nurtured in an atmosphere of wrath and judgment, as the years went by he found moral censure becoming distasteful and finally impossible. In moments of personal excitement he might invoke it, but it was always a manifest pretence. In his later letters, tolerance is a recurrent theme. ' Less and less can I endure the idea of punishing a man—who is not cruel—because he is unlike other men.' And again, ' I have long outlived the wish that anybody should receive any moral impression.' And yet again, ' The author must be a curious person, so completely a-moral and detached. It is refreshing to read him after the nausea of letters to " The Times " by the Bishops of — and —.'

Thus he escaped the demons. But out of Plymouth he retained a certain discipline that never failed him. The routine of his life was perfectly ordered, and in the fulfilment of every obligation he was punctilious. Apart from

squalls, his intellectual and social life was perfectly harmonious, conducted with an economy that made the most of it for himself, for his friends, and for his work. No man has ever done himself and his talents fuller justice. He once told me that in re-reading the Victorians he was more and more convinced that of them all Matthew Arnold had least waste tissue. It was a triumph of his own character that in the management of his life there was none.

'Gosse,' says Mr Charteris, 'was never mercenary. His tendency was always to take the terms that were offered, without exploring further the market value of his wares. He appeared perfectly content with the results.' Towards the end of his life he one day told me what payment he was receiving for certain work. I was horrified at its inadequacy, and begged him to ask for better terms, which I was sure would at once be conceded. He agreed that the arrangement was not handsome, but said that it would be too disagreeable a matter for discussion.

The last time I saw him was on March 20, 1928, two months before he died. I had been to some function for lunch, and was walking along Pall Mall, contemplating the pavement. I was half aware of something familiar passing me, and a few yards further on I turned round. I saw the receding figure of Gosse, and for the first time I was struck by his age. I hurried back after him, and placing my arm in his, asked him where he was going. To the Piccadilly Tube station. He seemed to be too old for solitary wandering among London traffic, and I proposed myself for company. On the way up the Haymarket he told me that he was troubled. He had to attend an Ibsen dinner at the Norwegian Legation that evening, and was anxious about getting home afterwards. I was going to the same dinner, and asked if I might be his escort. This relieved his mind, and I saw him descending by the lift. At night he waited until courtesy allowed him to suggest to me that he would like to leave. I was also taking H. G. Wells home. Mr Charteris quotes a letter from Gosse written to Henry James in 1912, about Mr Wells's then most recent novel.

'Have you read "*Marriage*"? Too hard, metallic, rhetorical. I plucked up courage in both hands, and wrote and told him so—warned him against the growing *hardness*

of his books. He replied with the greatest good-nature, not the least offended, saying he believed it to be true, and that he should make a strong effort to throw it off. I thought it charming of him to take it in this simple and charming way.'

Subsequently there had been some coolness between them. When they got into the back seat of my small car together, I think they had not seen anything of each other for a long time. But they at once fell to talking with the greatest cordiality. I heard Gosse telling Wells of his lasting admiration for certain of his books. The praise clearly gave the pleasure that it always did. Drawing up outside 17, Hanover Terrace, I was told by Gosse that my poor old Uncle was very much obliged to me, but that my car was an uncommonly difficult one to get out of, as it was. Wells and I manœuvred him through the entanglements of the front seat, and watched him up the steps of his house. He said Good-night, but it was Good-bye.

JOHN DRINKWATER.

Art. 10.—GALLIÉNI AND JOFFRE AT THE MARNE.

Joffre et la Marne. Par Commandant Muller, Officier d'Ordonnance du Général Joffre pendant la bataille. Paris: G. Crès, 1931.

FOR years after the Battle of the Marne was decided, it was refought on paper in France. The issue turned, above all, on the question of Galliéni's influence on Joffre in moulding the plan of the battle as it was fought and in giving the decisive urge to its delivery. According to Galliéni's memoirs, that urge was administered in a telephone discussion with Joffre on the evening of Sept. 4, 1914. The account in the memoirs, which were published posthumously and post-war, was both bare and restrained, but it was supplemented by the record of General Clergerie, Galliéni's chief of staff, as well as by the private comments of Galliéni, which were preserved and published by his secretaries. Long before this evidence was published, a knowledge of Galliéni's part had begun to spread through French official circles, despite the strenuous efforts of French General Headquarters ('G.Q.G.') to conserve all the credit of the victory for that body and its titular head, Joffre. And the French Government became so well assured as to Galliéni's influence on the victory that it created him posthumously a Marshal of France in belated recognition of, and gratitude to, him.

But when the French Historical Section went through the archives of G.Q.G. after the war, preparing its documents for publication in the official history, no record was found of this reported telephone conversation. The absence of such confirmation of Galliéni's influence has to some extent revived the controversy, although more in England than in France, where there is less trustfulness in the veracity and infallibility of official documents. In this country Brig.-General E. L. Spears published last autumn his book '*Liaison*,' which while primarily a vivid and valuable account of his personal impressions as a liaison officer during the Retreat of 1914, attempted also to provide a full and final historical account of the Marne. The latter he based almost entirely on the published volumes of documents which serve as the

French Official History, and he seemed to have a rather slight acquaintance with the general body of literature relating to the controversy which has been published in France. In supporting the claims for Joffre and minimising the influence of Galliéni, he adopted and incorporated sundry criticisms previously published by Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice. Then in the January issue of the 'Quarterly Review,' General Maurice expressed his warm approval of General Spears's version of the Marne and reaffirmed his own belief that Galliéni had exercised but little influence on Joffre's decision.

General Maurice pointed to Joffre's Instruction Générale No. 2 of Aug. 25 as containing his plan for the Marne in the paragraph: 'It being impossible to carry out the offensive manœuvre which had been projected, future operations will have as their objective to re-form on our left a mass capable of resuming that offensive.' General Maurice added the comment, 'To this plan Joffre adhered throughout the severe strain of the retreat. . . . ' He then related how Joffre received information as early as Sept. 1 of von Kluck's change of direction and consequent exposure of his flank, while Galliéni was left to discover the fact for himself, and so did not learn it until late on Sept. 3.

Early next morning Galliéni made proposals to Joffre by telephone for a counterstroke either on the north or on the south bank of the Marne, indicating his own preference for the former as the more prompt and more effective stroke. He received a reply from G.Q.G. that, of the two proposals, Joffre preferred the latter. But the reply did not indicate that the proposal was to be put into action. Soon after midday, however, Joffre telegraphed to Franchet d'Esperey, the new commander of the Fifth Army, asking if he thought that his army was in a condition to deliver battle 'with prospect of success.' At 4 p.m. Franchet d'Esperey sent a telegram in the affirmative, although saying that the battle could 'only take place the day after to-morrow.' He followed it with a second telegram which sounded a rather dubious note and put various qualifying conditions.

Galliéni meantime had been striving to obtain British co-operation, and so did not learn of Joffre's answer to his morning proposals until his return to his headquarters

early in the evening. He then, according to the accounts of himself and his staff, made the vehement appeal to Joffre on the telephone which led to the decision for battle, and to the launching of the stroke on the north bank of the Marne. Having won Joffre over to this decision, Galliéni issued his own orders at 8.30 p.m. The issue of Joffre's general order was timed 10 p.m. In his article, General Maurice disputed the fact that any such telephone conversation took place, at least until after Joffre had issued his general order. In support of his disbelief he stated, 'Marshal Joffre has informed me that he has no recollection of such a conversation at 7 p.m.' While ready to accept Joffre's assurance as safe evidence, General Maurice dismissed Clergerie as an untrustworthy witness. In General Maurice's view the only conversation could have been when 'at or about 10 p.m. Joffre himself telephoned to Galliéni, giving him a summary of his Instruction Générale No. 6.'

As for Galliéni's claim to have issued his orders at 8.30 p.m., General Maurice considered that it was baseless and 'regrettable,' while General Spears even implied that it rested on a base fabrication. In demolishing the claim General Maurice emphasised that 'the order in question, said to have been issued at 8.30 p.m., is dated Sept. 4, 10.30 a.m., in the Appendix to Galliéni's "Mémoires." ' 'It seems to be stretching the possibilities of coincidence very far to suppose that at ten in the morning Galliéni should have hit upon the very front for the British Army which was proposed by Franchet d'Esperey, miles away, at four in the afternoon.' The implication was thus that Galliéni's order contained a falsification. In fastening on this apparent slip of Galliéni or his staff, it was General Maurice, however, who slipped. For in the Annexes to the French Official History the order is reproduced with the time '20.30,' i.e. 8.30 p.m. Even if he had not checked his reference, the fact that military orders are timed on the 24-hour system might surely have put General Maurice on his guard against the obvious misprint of '10.30' for '20.30,' which occurred in the popular edition of Galliéni's memoirs. And caution would have saved him from elaborating so weighty an argument from so trivial a numeral. Nevertheless, until recently there was no decisive proof of Galliéni's telephone

argument with Joffre. Historical students who felt that Galliéni's statement rang true and fitted in with the general trend of the evidence, had to depend on deduction to fill the gap in the files of G.Q.G.

We know that Clergerie, and others, have plainly hinted that there was tampering with the files after the event. If any tampering took place, the power to do it obviously lay not with Galliéni's entourage but with Joffre's, who for two years after the Marne and eight months after Galliéni was in his grave held control of the archives. The historian's suspicion that some of Joffre's assistants were not above such practices is naturally increased by knowledge of the way in which they brought about the downfall of General Michel, the man who before the war had opposed their blind offensive doctrine and plan, and the man whom the event justified. As they, in contrast, were proved colossally in error, it was natural that they should strive to keep all the credit for the Marne in order to offset the undeniable stigma of the opening battles. And we know from many sources, including M. Poincaré, that Joffre manifested his jealousy of Galliéni, his designated successor. Hence the motive for tampering is established.

Moreover, we know that at least one vital record has disappeared. Significantly, it is one that would reinforce Galliéni's claim to influence—the two-branched plan submitted by him on the morning of Sept. 4. The French Official History states, 'No trace of the proposals made by General Galliéni has been found in the archives of the Military Governor of Paris or those of G.Q.G. Their existence is only revealed by the reply made to them (by telegram) by General Joffre.' It is almost inconceivable that no record of these proposals was kept at either headquarters, and most improbable that such record could disappear save by deliberate destruction. The natural inference would seem to be that whoever suppressed the evidence of Galliéni's proposals made the slip that is characteristic of many too clever plotters by overlooking the fact that Joffre's telegram would be a proof that those proposals had been made.

The circumstantial evidence for Galliéni's influence on Sept. 4 is strengthened by the evidence as to Joffre's outlook in the preceding days. Although General Maurice

sees the Marne 'plan' in Joffre's Instruction Générale of Aug. 25, the connection between its vague phrase and the actual plan of Sept. 4 is surely far stretched. Could any defeated commander speak otherwise than to express the intention of eventually resuming the offensive? Reality turns on the time factor. General Maurice omitted to mention in his article that Joffre's order of Aug. 25 went on to ordain a concentration of force on his left wing for the purpose of delivering a stroke from Amiens eastwards. This concentration, and Joffre's dream, were dispersed by the swift onrush of the German armies in the days that followed. And the forces assembled for the stroke were handed over to the defence of Paris.

A week later, on Sept. 1, Joffre issued a new order in which he foreshadowed a retreat south of the Seine. Next day he sent a secret note to his army commanders, in which he indicated a line still farther south, where they would 'fortify themselves' and await 'drafts from the depots.' This note has the greater historical significance because Joffre, unlike Galliéni, had already received news of von Kluck's swerve and the opportunity thus offered. It shows that he had no intention of seizing the opportunity. And on the morning of Sept. 4 itself, as we know from our own records, Joffre discouraged such an idea in a communication to Sir John French. Thus it is a sure conclusion that the dramatic and decisive change in Joffre's outlook came during the later hours of that day.

This mosaic of positive and negative evidence satisfied many students that Galliéni's claim was well-founded. But until recently it was still possible for others to base an argument on the absence of confirmation from Joffre's side that Galliéni's *coups de téléphone* had been delivered. Now, however, that argument has been decisively upset by a volume 'Joffre et la Marne' published by Commandant Muller, Joffre's aide-de-camp during the crisis. Written in affectionate admiration, the book naturally makes out the best case possible for Joffre. Its importance to the historian thus lies not so much in its claims as in its admissions.

It gives an account of Joffre's daily life and states that Joffre lodged alone with his two aides-de-camp, who were

later joined by his *chef du cabinet*. It mentions the proposals for an offensive, against the Germans' exposed flank, which came by telephone from Galliéni on the morning of Sept. 4. And it reveals that a violent discussion raged among Joffre's staff, one side urging that the opportunity be seized and the other that the retreat be continued. 'The General listens, without giving an opinion.' It is known, from other sources, that General Berthelot was the chief advocate of a continued retreat, while Lt-Colonel Gamelin represented the contrary view. As Berthelot, the Henry Wilson of France, was the guiding brain of G.Q.G. strategy, we can the better understand Joffre's hesitation, and realise how powerful a pressure was needed to induce Joffre to overrule Berthelot's opinion. At 12.45 p.m. he moved so far as to send a telegram to Franchet d'Esperey's Army, 'asking for precise information as to its moral and material situation.' The answer, in the form of two notes, was moderately if far from wholly encouraging. But we learn from Commandant Muller that they only came while Joffre was at dinner, being brought by a liaison officer. Now comes the vital revelation :

'While, towards 8 p.m., the General is making himself acquainted with these documents, he is called to the telephone by the Governor of Paris [Galliéni].' 'General Galliéni . . . tells General Joffre that he has taken his dispositions for an attack north of the Marne . . . and he insists that its delivery should take place, without any change being made in the conditions of time and site arranged. Very quickly, the Commander-in-Chief accepts suggestions which accord, moreover, with the general action which he has already admitted as an eventuality, and which at this minute, feeling himself sufficiently enlightened, he decides upon irrevocably. He promptly declares his decision to the Governor of Paris, who, without waiting for written confirmation, issues his own orders to the Sixth Army.'

Muller's account not merely settles the question of the telephone discussion, but brings out the vehement nature of Galliéni's arguments far more than does the discreet and modest version in Galliéni's memoirs. He was privileged to use such an emphatic tone, and it was likely to have the more force, because he had been Joffre's former chief in Madagascar and later had recommended

Joffre for the headship of the French Army when declining it himself from scruples that did him honour.

From Muller we learn that Joffre had such a dislike of the telephone that he 'even pretended not to understand how to handle it.' Hence his personal conversation with Galliéni has the greater significance, while his action in giving a decision over the telephone formed 'an exception, perhaps without a second.' Muller argues that this breach of habit suggests that Joffre had 'virtually' made up his mind when the discussion began. The impartial historian will attach more significance to Muller's revelation that it was only after, and immediately after, the discussion that Joffre told his staff that he had decided to fight on the Marne.

B. H. LIDDELL HART.

Art. 11.—A CONSERVATIVE SURVEY.

THE second year of the Labour Government has certainly brought small satisfaction to any political party, to Parliament, or to the country. The intense industrial depression, the gigantic financial burden, the menacing figure of unemployment have produced a public atmosphere of stagnation and inertia approaching despair. At the same time, an increasing doubt as to the ability or desire of either Ministry or Parliament to face and concentrate their attention upon the national distresses, far less to form correct judgments on them or to grapple with them effectively, has for the first time almost shaken general confidence in British political institutions. To the nation distraught with its individual troubles, when industry, finance, agriculture, labour do not know what the next day may bring forth, the politicians seem to be pirouetting and gyrating with the aimless detachment of gnats above a torrent.

This situation has had, naturally enough, its reactions upon the different political parties. All have spent a most uneasy twelvemonth. The Labour party, to deal with it first, in the House of Commons has watched with listless indifference the paralysed inaction of the Government. The members still troop into the Lobby when the division bell rings. But they are a team out of which the heart has gone, stolidly carrying on the match, but all ears for the sound of the referee's final whistle. Structurally, the party is in process of disintegration. The machine is falling to bits. One piece has already been patented by Sir Oswald Mosley as 'The New Party.' The I.L.P., once the prime motive force in the whole mechanism, has ceased to function. The fundamental incompatibility between the outlook and principles of the Co-operative and the Socialist movements has yet to develop. But the Co-operative representatives in and around the Cabinet have at least helped to prevent the adoption of a protective policy, which a year ago seemed probable and which, after all, is only a logical extension of the Trades Union outlook. And the Co-operative Societies are extensive owners of real property. Taxation of land values, as now proposed, cannot but hasten the inevitable breach. Meantime, with the *moral* of the

party both in the House and the constituencies fast ebbing away and the machine they so laboriously constructed beginning to creak and groan very ominously, Mr Ramsay MacDonald and Mr Henderson have been hard at work rigging up a temporary substitute with Mr Lloyd George and Sir Herbert Samuel.

The Liberal situation has been even more uneasy. The party has now definitely split into two sections. Having started in this Parliament with the stimulating feeling that it had everything to gain and nothing to lose, it is now reduced to wondering whether its leader and his chief-of-staff can outmanœuvre the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary. The days are gone when Liberal intellect was to "conquer unemployment." It is true that the Liberals have the death of the Trades Disputes Bill to their credit, and that they have not been without influence in the agricultural legislation of the present session. But self-preservation is the fundamental rule of political life, and it is in an effort to obtain the Alternative Vote that their energies are now concentrated. That is to be the prize which reconciles them to the huckstering and juggling of which they are at heart ashamed. But in the country, their forces, being more dispirited in any case and less disciplined than their Labour allies, are throwing away their arms and leaving the battlefield *en masse*. It may be that these joint and several manœuvres of Liberal and Labour are only an elaborate courtship performance, which will lead in due time to the union of the two parties. But at the moment the country shows no inclination to 'kiss the couple and wish them joy.' On the contrary, it watches the posturings and sidlings with irritation and disgust. The whole affair has but deepened the impression, now so frequently expressed out of doors, that most of the leading political figures of to-day are mere adventurers and careerists.

Much more important and far more dramatic has been the struggle which has gone on in the Conservative party. It has seldom spent a more uncomfortable year. It, too, has seen the attempt to form a new party, exacerbated by a bitter vendetta against its leader.

The attacks on Mr Baldwin and their repulse have been the most significant and most crucial event in recent political history. It is an incident of which the

importance extends far beyond the domestic concerns of party life. If Mr Baldwin had fallen, as at times it seemed he must, the effect upon public life and democratic politics would have been calamitous. The stage would have been set definitely for a political class-war. For those in the Conservative party who hated Mr Baldwin hate democracy. Their dislike spread to him, because he, Tory though he be, is making the only great political experiment which is being made in Britain to-day. He is treating democracy with consideration and respect. He neither fears nor hates it. Therefore, he does not flatter or abuse it, neither contemns nor cringes. That is why, of course, he has secured for himself a unique position. The people of this country know that Mr Baldwin trusts them. They therefore trust him as they trust no one else. Here, they feel, at least is a public man who is not one of the adventurers or careerists. But, for this very reason, he is hated by all who are. They have, it is true, another reason for hating him; because for careerists and adventurers Mr Baldwin himself does not greatly care. They recognise him, in consequence, as their natural enemy as quickly as a snake recognises a mongoose. That is the explanation at root of the persistent attempts which have been made during the past year to destroy Mr Baldwin. These attempts are over now. Mr Baldwin has fairly and finally beaten them. As usual he does not seem to have reaped the full fruits of his victory, any more than he did for his handling of the General Strike. But his methods are not those of the sky-sign and the brass band; as a result, it has been all taken for granted. Time and again his opponents were confident that they had got him. His chances indeed seemed about as good as were Cæsar's against the conspirators—for throughout there has been the atmosphere not of a fight but of an assassination. And as in old Scottish history, a group of nobles, of essentially divergent interests, used to enter into a solemn 'band' with each other to destroy a common enemy, so against the Unionist leader the most diverse types of enemy were arrayed.

The main attack, of course, came from the Beaverbrook-Rothermere press. But even that was only an uneasy alliance. Lord Beaverbrook, however transatlantic his political methods may be, is at heart an

imperial idealist. He genuinely desired, as all Conservatives desire, to strengthen the Empire. He is, in fact, a Conservative. The misfortune has been that the Empire Crusade collected a staff whose public activities had made the word Empire a stalking-horse for manoeuvres both squalid and selfish. As a political organisation, it attracted every political cut-purse and fly-by-night. It had, of course, its share of the watering-place and spa population. But the best man in it was its leader. It was well named a Crusade; for like its medieval fore-runners it had an irresistible attraction for the unoccupied riff-raff. But Lord Beaverbrook flung himself into the fight with something of a real crusading zeal. He was trying out his own ideas for himself. Very different was his ally. Enmity and spite were Lord Rothermere's leading motives. His political affinities were with Mr Lloyd George. He hated Mr Baldwin both as a type and as a Conservative. And he kept in the background—the dust and heat of battle were not for him. He showed no trace of vision or enthusiasm. Power was his aim, disclosed by and carried to the insolent pitch of a demand to be consulted as to the *personnel* of the next Unionist Government. 'My measures from any man' was apparently Lord Beaverbrook's objective. 'My men and any measures' was obviously Lord Rothermere's. But whatever their differences, the press attack upon Mr Baldwin, and through him the attempt to control the Unionist party, was in fact the greatest danger that democratic politics have run since the General Strike. The issue was fundamentally the same. 'By permission of the T.U.C.' was merely to be exchanged for 'By permission of Lord Rothermere.'

Formidable as the Rothermere-Beaverbrook attack was, it might have been disregarded—no doubt it would never have been made—but for the fact that it crystallised the vague feeling of hostility to Mr Baldwin of those Conservatives who, consciously or unconsciously, hate and fear modern democracy. These are the men who have never ceased to complain that between 1924 and 1929 Mr Baldwin, 'in spite of his huge majority, did nothing.' What they mean is that he did nothing to relieve them of the spectre which is never absent from their minds. In short, the right wing of the party, the

Diehards, and such industrialists as, engrossed at home in their business concerns, leave their politics to their Parliamentary jackals, found that all the worst they had ever felt or thought about Mr Baldwin was expressed by the press attack. And that was not all. Behind the scenes some of the younger Parliamentarians were manœuvring for position, against the time, which looked so near, when the leadership should be vacant. From the left flank, however, the attack never indeed fully developed. Some intrigued with Sir Oswald Mosley. Some began to think that after all Mr Lloyd George provided their spiritual home. They had nothing in common with the Diehards; but might not the 'Forty Thieves' have their uses? For the most part they kept discreetly in the background. Even so, it was all very exciting. It offered endless opportunity for vague discussion about vague policies. It made one feel very clever and very important. In essence, it was Fox and North over again, or, to take a more modern parallel, it was the political equivalent of the pact between the boot-leggers and the 'unco' guid' which prohibition has brought into existence in the United States, or the alliance between the bookies and the parsons which tainted the passage of the Totalisator Act during last Parliament.

So much for the conspirators. Now, one of the difficulties for Mr Baldwin was that assassination is so difficult to guard against. There is no political police protection. Mr Baldwin had to walk abroad by himself. It was 'his funeral.' And as the plot thickened, some of those who, from their personal belief in and admiration for him, should have actively supported him, seemed to draw away. Personally, they said, they wanted no change—still, of course, if Mr Baldwin was really as unpopular as he seemed to be, it might be that 'for the sake of the Party' he ought to go. Much as they liked him, said some, they really had to avoid mentioning his name in their constituencies. However, though there were some unexpected Mr Fainthearts, the truth was that no one could save Mr Baldwin except himself. But then, on the other hand, though he did not seem to be trying to save himself, curiously enough he did not seem to be actually going to die. Apparently, after all, direct action was necessary. So a party meeting was demanded last October, to which

Peers, Members of the House of Commons, and candidates were summoned. Mysterious cloak-and-dagger colloquies took place. Three days before the meeting there was issued to the Press, late at night, the statement that forty-two Conservative members, whose names were given, had resolved that 'a change in the leadership was essential in the national interests.' Who issued it has never been definitely established. In any case it blew the conspiracy sky-high. There was not a name, amongst those given, which carried the slightest weight. The immediate reaction on opinion was that if these were the people who thought Mr Baldwin should go, it was pretty obviously 'essential' that he should stay. What followed was pure comedy. Some of the supposed signatories had attended no meeting. Some had left before the resolution was decided on. Some who had stayed to the end did not know there had been a resolution at all. The lobbies of the House of Commons resounded with explanations, contradictions, expostulations, and lamentations. One gallant signatory, ensconced in a safe home-county seat, was soundly rated for his action by his local association. Could it be that Mr Baldwin was not so terribly unpopular after all? The party meeting followed. Colonel Gretton, plucky to the last, moved the resolution of censure. How flimsy that indictment was became clear to all when one of the main counts turned out to be the action of Mr Baldwin's Government at Han-kow. Still, a quarter of the meeting supported the resolution. It was not perhaps quite a full meeting of the party, for some of the left flankers found that they had business elsewhere. However, if not Trafalgar, it was at any rate Jutland.

And so it has proved. There has never again been a pitched battle with all the enemy forces engaged. Many returned to their allegiance forthwith. A single sentence to the Bright Young Things, artlessly let fall from the platform by Mr Baldwin, brought them scampering home. Lord Beaverbrook stuck to his guns. It needed the Westminster election, fought directly on the 'Baldwin issue,' to convince him that the game was up. There remained a final episode. Mr Churchill feels deeply but vaguely that there should be a different policy pursued towards India. When he made his views public he found himself a hero in the Conservative quarters where

previously he had been least appreciated. His artistic temperament took fire. New prospects seemed to open before his vivid imagination. Had the great moment come? What did come was a debate on India in which Mr Baldwin spoke. It was enough. The Churchill rainbow faded. With that, peace has been declared in the Unionist party. Mr Baldwin also, it seems, is one of the 'nasty-tempered animals which when attacked defend themselves.' A curious sequel has been the insignificance into which the claimants for the throne have fallen. Perhaps they were not such pre-eminent statesmen as they thought. Certainly Lord Hailsham, who was the favourite, has happened upon evil days. His friends were wont to say charitably that Mr Baldwin had forced him to become Lord Chancellor and retire to the House of Lords in order to rid himself of a dangerous rival. In Lord Salisbury's absence, he has been leading the Peers, and in that comparatively simple task he has not shown conspicuous judgment or common sense. Any suggestion that he should take Mr Baldwin's place would to-day be laughed out of court.

What have been the results of this long-continued battle? First, Mr Baldwin has added, in the eyes of the country, a cubit to his stature. It is now seen that it is not because he cannot fight that he is a man of peace. Secondly, the character of the opposition to him has been now fully revealed. The intriguers, indeed, have made the best possible foil to Mr Baldwin. The contrast between their methods, outlook and personalities, and his was so obvious that he who ran could read. So much for the personal result. But that is the lesser fruit. The main result is that the Conservative party is preserved intact, that it is more in harmony with itself than at any time since the end of the General Strike. Mr Baldwin has shown himself to have the first indispensable quality of a party leader. For a leader who cannot hold his party together is wanting in the first qualification. Without it all others are mere sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Thus the Conservative party remains united at a time when the others are in the melting-pot. Thanks to Mr Baldwin's victory, it is capable of being an adequate instrument of government, for the double reason that it is at one with itself again and that—what is essential if

a party is to govern with success—its leader is now clearly master in his own house. Such a result has been more than worth the mutterings, grumbings, and uncertainties of the last two years.

But it is not enough that unity should make a party a fit instrument of government. To govern, it must secure the approval of the country. How far does the Conservative party, so far as by-elections and other available evidence can indicate, command approval and arouse enthusiastic support? Here, it must frankly be admitted, the position is rather that the Labour party has produced in its adherents a sense of complete disillusionment, the Liberal party one of active distrust, rather than that the Unionist on its own merits is recovering for itself and by itself, any general confidence. The reasons for this can only, perhaps, be guessed at, but two at least seem fairly clear. The middle classes, the 'business men' of all grades, have a growing distrust of politicians, who, they think, are bound to curry favour with the great electoral block of wage-earners. And the wage-earners, they think, must always be, if not socialists in theory, at least in practice, supporters of a Labour party. That class constantly says to-day that 'the Unionist party is as bad as the others.' It is, of course, true, perhaps particularly of men immersed in business, that they look at politics primarily as it affects themselves and still more their pockets. None the less, they instinctively feel the absence of any expression of Conservative principle in the Conservative programme. It looks as if the Conservative middle classes could not be effectively stirred out of their political apathy and despair unless and until they see the Conservative party actively and energetically pursuing a Conservative objective. What is the ultimate objective of Conservative thought? Must it not be to secure stability in the economic and social structure? And is not a stable condition in the national life exactly what the business classes are so anxious to secure? A policy directed at securing economic and social stability, once the business classes are satisfied that it is capable of attaining its object, cannot but commend itself to them; for it will make them feel that the Conservative party, in propounding it, is facing the realities of the situation.

But what of the wage-earners? The failure, if failure

to-day there be, of the Conservative party to regain fully their confidence is due to other causes. Slowly the working people are beginning to realise the necessity of Protection. They feel that it may involve sacrifices for themselves. They are becoming prepared to take the risk, imaginary or real, which they think it involves for themselves. That is not where the danger-point lies. But they do not think that from the well-to-do, employing, investing, and property-owning classes any equivalent sacrifice would be called for by the introduction of a tariff. They cannot rid themselves of the belief that these classes will be the most immediate and assured gainers. And, indeed, it is certain that an industrial tariff would immediately raise the capital value of every share in every British industrial concern, and that any adequate measure for improving the prospects of British agriculture would inevitably enhance the value of land. What corresponding advantage would come, with equal speed, to the wage-earners? No doubt it would check the fall in wages which is inevitable if the free import of manufactured goods continues. But dividends respond to prosperity more rapidly than wages. Wage increases have always a serious time-lag. They frequently involve industrial disputes and not seldom prolonged strikes. Conservative policy, if it is to allay these not unnatural suspicions and anxieties, must, it would seem, do all that can be done to ensure that the benefit of a tariff comes as quickly and as easily to employed as to employer. Moreover, Protection of itself does not solve the problem of the relations of Capital and Labour. But it is that very question which to-day is the main if not the sole cause of the want of social stability. In a word, the work of Conservatism for the nation will only be half done if in the industrial sphere it confines itself to the introduction of a tariff.

Some Conservative politicians, particularly those perhaps whose conversion from Free Trade is recent, are perhaps anxious that a tariff should be accompanied with safeguards for the consumer. They are aiming at the wrong target. The consumer can and does take care of himself, or rather, in modern conditions it is obviously to the interests of the producer to take care of him. It cannot be too often repeated that large production, quick turn-over is the essence of modern industrial economics.

The Conservative party is a producer's party. There it is right. There it grapples with the centre of the problem. But it must also see to it that producers as a whole, the hand as well as the brain, labour as well as capital and management, receive a full share of the benefits which, as Conservatives believe, will flow from a producer's policy. Is there any way to do this except by profit-sharing, co-partnership, and share-owning by the wage-earners? Protection introduced without any attempt to secure equally full and equally rapid participation in advancing prosperity for employed as for employer will inevitably lead to a fresh period of social and industrial disturbance.

And more. Major opportunities in politics do not often arise, and hardly ever recur. Such an opportunity is the change-over from Free Trade to Protection. The introduction of a tariff can be handled so as immensely to enhance the strength and stability of the social structure, to improve permanently and put on a new basis the relation of capital and labour and to fortify the capitalist system in its best sense. But alternatively it can be treated as a mere emergency measure, seen in isolation, half not fully used, and, out of the common extremity which brings it about, resulting that only the existing capitalist will reap the immediate and the full benefit. It may be said that the introduction of the principle that both labour and capital should share in the profits after each has received a wage is no matter for the politician, because it cannot be brought about, usefully at all events, by legislation. But the politician has other functions besides passing acts of Parliament. A great party must form and lead opinion. The industrialist should know more about industry; the wage-earner about the problems of labour; these are their special provinces. The province of the politician is the body-politic, the community as a whole. And where the welfare of the body-politic is concerned, the politician, if he is properly to exercise his function, must speak with authority, because he speaks of what he knows. It is for the Unionist party frankly and clearly to tell the employing, investing classes that, if by a tariff they are to secure economic security, they must make the necessary sacrifice, if sacrifice it be, in order that fair dealing between all the partners in production should, with the coming of prosperity, secure social stability.

The sacrifice, if sacrifice it be, cannot be made by the politicians. An Act of Parliament no doubt could force some system of the sharing of profits upon a reluctant industry. But that clearly would be to bring not peace but a sword. It can only be made by the employing classes themselves. Nor will they receive much ostensible support or approval from organised labour. The official Trades Unionist leaders have always given the cold shoulder to any such solution of the problem of capital and labour. But behind the scenes the pressure put upon them by the individual wage-earners would make opposition a mere demonstration. And once the question was brought into the forefront, declared by the Conservative party to be the solution which it recommends and would further and facilitate in every available way, the support it would command would be both powerful and widespread. This needs must be, since of any other method of stabilising the relations between capital and labour there is no sign. Many employers say that all the working man wants is steady employment at a good wage. That, no doubt, is true of many wage-earners; but the history of the last two generations shows that neither steady employment nor good wages puts an end to the 'pull devil pull baker' between the two elements in production. And it is inevitable that, till rivalry is exchanged for partnership in the fruits of industry, there cannot be permanent peace.

Is the sacrifice, if sacrifice it be, worth making? There are employers who are content to face an interminable prospect of recurrent disputes and of a constant pressure upon them to increase wages, however crushing an addition to the cost of production these may be, rather than run the risk that the development of profit-sharing and co-partnership should bring with it an increasing participation of labour in management. No doubt such participation would come; but what these employers forget is that it would come to labour after its outlook had become that of property owners, not of mere wage-earners. A closer relation of labour with management, in these conditions, would facilitate, not embarrass, the conduct of industrial concerns. Is the sacrifice worth making? Those who think it unnecessary little realise the forces that are at work in the modern world. Private enterprise is being subjected to a challenge which constantly

increases. On any wide survey of the movements sweeping through the mind of mankind, the portent of Bolshevik Russia must take, from an economic as well as a social and a constitutional point of view, the first place. Within the last few months, indeed, British industrialists have become anxious and alarmed at the progress of the Five Years Plan. In the most unexpected markets and with the most unexpected products the competition of Russia is beginning to be felt. Every exporting success which Russia obtains will seem to the mind of labour another proof of the failure of the capitalist system. It is of no avail to say that slave labour is less efficient than free. However strong and remorseless be the compulsion applied to the Russian population, it is clear that the Bolshevik system is vitally different from the easy-going unorganised slipshod slave systems of the past. In every previous form of slave labour the slaves were a depressed class owned or controlled by a dominant one. But in Russia there is at any rate absent the galling element of class-jealousy. If in Russia 'he who does not work, does not live,' the application of this Spartan rule is at least universal. And, moreover, qualified observers seem to agree that, however dimly, the working population is conscious of taking part in a new Evangel. There is the atmosphere of a national revival as well as of a national campaign stimulating and encouraging the Russian people. We may think of them as slaves. But the vital thing in considering the economic efficiency of the system is not what we think of them, but what they think of themselves. The leaders of Russia have created a new economic weapon; they are prepared, with this new weapon, to wage an economic war, remorseless and bitter. It may well be that no adequate defence except an international boycott of Russian goods is available to the capitalist countries. But even that measure might not secure safety. The real answer, the only complete defence, to the underlying menace of Russia is that the whole body of producers should share in the fruits of industry. It is this immense new fact, this menacing portent, the full effects of which can only be guessed at, which makes it essential to-day that the capitalist system, with all it implies in the way of a heightened standard of life, should be reinforced and

underpinned. To assume that a wage-earning population, which enjoys full political status and the intellectual status which unrestricted opportunities for education imply, will, in the totally new situation which the Russian Revolution has produced, be permanently satisfied with an economic status which is merely that of one of the costs of production, is to live in a fool's paradise.

And further. No one can say how severe will be the economic injury suffered by Britain from the Russian economic war. It may call for sacrifices from us not less severe than those which to-day are being made in Russia. Who could seriously maintain that the economic status of labour and its position relative to capital are such as to give the best foundation for calling upon it to make, in defence even of its own standard of living, any serious sacrifice? These may be thought to be considerations distant and therefore negligible. But there are still others. Conservatives say and believe that the coming of a tariff will restore prosperity. But the restoration of industrial Britain is, even with Protection, a soldier's battle. It depends upon the industrial zeal, the social content, the individual *moral* of the rank-and-file. Now it is the fact, however neglected by economists and politicians, that the raising of a worker from the position of mere wage-earner to that of partner and profit-sharer is a real stimulus to his economic energy and zeal. It is a commonplace that a man puts more energy and, what is even more important, more attention and mental effort into the work which he does for himself than for that which he does for another. Similarly, whereas rivalry involves contest, partnership brings content. So, too, improved status strengthens individual *moral*. We disregard every one of these unassailable truths of human nature, if we relegate labour permanently to the position of a mere wage-earner. The times forbid such disregard; for it may involve the difference between failure and success in the struggle to restore and advance industrial Britain.

Great opportunities come seldom. We have seen in our generation a great opportunity for unifying the nation thrown away. There has not been a more tragic anticlimax than the change from the Britain of the War to the Britain of to-day. Hard times necessarily follow in

the wake of war. The tragedy is the widespread sense that the sacrifices were in vain, the spirit of unity an illusion. For that, history will say that the shallow and squalid outlook of Mr Lloyd George and the hard-faced profiteers who have for him an apparently irresistible attraction, was responsible. The economic situation to-day is one of menace and of war. The people of this country are again preparing, this time in the economic sphere, to make what they regard as a sacrifice. It is essential that the spirit of sacrifice should not, in the event, be proved to have been called out primarily for the benefit of a class and not of the nation as a whole. This time all those who take the risk and make the effort must know that they are sharing in the fruits. And is there nothing else to be gained by the sharing of profits in industry? Economists are to-day concerned with the problem of 'glut,' of a production which consumption cannot overtake. Would not a more extended and rapid distribution of the profits of production, as opposed to increases of wages, which, as has been shown, come only after a serious time-lag and often involve the interruption of production, ensure a larger consumption by increasing and accelerating consuming power? If this be true, the concentration of the whole profits of production in the hands of capital, on its present comparatively restricted basis of distribution, prevents the production of wealth from achieving its full result.

There is still, it has been suggested above, an obvious hesitation amongst wage-earners to accept unreservedly the policy of Protection. Is there anything in the general policy of the Conservative party to dispel that hesitation; to reinforce, from the wage-earner's point of view, the policy of Protection pure and simple? What is the general policy, other than Protection, of the Conservative party? It centres round economy. There is to be, first, reduction of present expenditure; secondly, no new expenditure except 'for productive purposes.' Under the first branch will come reform in Unemployment Insurance—for it is a safe prophecy that the present Government and its allies will take no effective step here. That the nation as a whole is conscious of the defects of unemployment insurance and desires their correction is undoubted. But though from the *de haut en bas* position of the well-to-

do classes, there may seem to be little difference between the truly insured and those who continue to draw benefit long after the value of their contribution is exhausted, it is a very real distinction to the working people. It would be unjust and unsound in principle to make the truly insured and the truly uninsured equal sufferers from a reform. The Conservative party must look at this question from the ground, not the air. Its principles have always recognised that contribution brings with it a status which mere public assistance does not. That distinction must not be lost sight of in a flurry of economy. Contribution must be given its full weight, and however sharp a distinction it may be necessary to draw between those who are in truth insured and those who are not, drawn that distinction must be.

But, further, is reduction of existing expenditure to involve inconvenience to one class only, or is there to be common sacrifice? The well-to-do classes are certainly not going to be inconvenienced by economies resulting from Insurance reform. There is perhaps only one large head of national expenditure from the reduction of which they might suffer inconvenience. We have spent since the War 550,000,000*l.* upon roads. Much of this expenditure has been necessary, but large sums have been wasted upon the construction of what can only be called 'joy-roads.' These benefit nobody except the owners of the fastest types of car. Their use in commercial transport is often negligible. Often, too, such commercial use as there is merely adds, without any compensating advantage, to the difficulties of the admirable railway system of Britain. These joy-roads are, in truth, luxuries—and luxuries of the rich. Their multiplication must stop. The money thus saved could be made available for general budget purposes. A raid on the joy-road fund is surely sounder Conservatism than a raid on the benefits of the truly insured. The budget must be balanced, which it is not to-day. That can only be done by the joint effects of a tariff and of economy. Once the budget is balanced and borrowing for current expenditure brought to an end, Conservative policy aims at the relief of direct taxation. That direct taxation, at its present height, is a burden on industry is now admitted by the Labour party, as it has long been known to both the Conservative

and the Liberal. The reduction of income tax is imperative. None the less, it will be to the direct and immediate advantage of all the investing classes. What advantage commensurate and comparable will accrue to the wage-earning classes from these features of Unionist policy? One class, it would seem, is likely to be disproportionately advantaged from reforms which are admittedly necessary in the general national interests. Will that resolve the wage-earners' hesitation?

Again, there is to be no fresh expenditure except for 'productive purposes.' But what are these to be? They will be no doubt mainly connected with agriculture and the land. The land is the most impoverished of our national assets. And besides, a guaranteed price for British wheat of milling quality, if that is part of the official Conservative programme, will require an annual expenditure of possibly 6,000,000*l.* But wheat is primarily a large farm product. To the large farmer the direct benefit will go. Of course, it will employ agricultural labourers now out of work. It will be long before it beneficially affects their wage. There is no industry in which the time-lag is greater—greatest of all, in wages. The wage-earners' hesitation would surely be increased, if on the land 'expenditure for productive purposes' proved to be only one more item in the Conservative programme of which the benefits flowed primarily to the existing capitalists. Yet it is on the land, and indeed in modern conditions only on the land, that such expenditure can be applied to the primary benefit of men of the wage-earning section of the community. Is the Conservative party going to ensure that, when agriculture becomes a more profitable undertaking than it is reputed to be now, its policy will make it easy for men who want to cultivate land for themselves to get land to cultivate? Is land settlement, the development of small independent cultivators, to be or not to be one of its major objectives? At present, the attitude is that it is useless to put men on the land 'when agriculture does not pay.' But what when it does pay? Unless land settlement is definitely accepted by the Conservative party, at the moment when the remedial measures for agriculture are to be put into operation, it is most unlikely that it will be accepted later on. For the more

the present agriculturalists find their industry a profitable one, the less inclined will they be to let others into it, the more they will become a close corporation. Even now, we are well acquainted with the paradox that, whereas agriculture is said not to pay, the moment that a particular farm is taken for settlement purposes, it becomes apparently ideally prosperous in its existing form. In short, a producer's policy in agriculture as at present formulated runs at the moment exactly the same risk as it does in industry of conferring the substantial benefits on one class of the community.

Of Conservatives who may read these paragraphs many may find them inconvenient and untimely. Let them survey the situation for themselves. They hope, and with justification, that we are on the verge of exchanging Free Trade for Protection—in their view an essential revolution, if the economic life of Britain is to be saved. They know very well that the attack on capitalism, which is the attack on the principle of the private ownership of property and of private enterprise, is gathering force and, with the growing economic menace of Bolshevik Russia, is now knocking loudly at our doors. They know that at home there will be no social stability until the relations of capital and labour are made stable. By their side, too, stalks the spectre of democracy, unstable, fickle, unaccountable. They believe that, if Conservative principles were put into force, security would replace anxiety, order replace confusion, stability replace flux. There stands ready but neglected the Conservative truth that it is the status of property-owning which gives a man security, stability, love of order. It surely puts no undue strain on powers either of vision or of reason to appreciate the fact that if property-owning is to be made secure, or even to survive, the classes which at present in their work have no property-interest must be enlisted in its support, that on the land a new army of property-owners must be created, that in a democracy, property-owning must be widely spread, so that it becomes a national not a class attribute, and that the cause of stability, order, security is for our country inseparably bound up with its development into a property-owning democracy.

NOEL SKELTON.

Art. 12.—THE PALESTINE CONFLICT.

1. *History of Palestine*. By Angelo Rappoport. Allen & Unwin, 1931.
2. *The Handbook of Palestine and Trans-Jordan*. Edited by H. C. Luke, C.M.G., and E. K. Roach. Second Edition. Macmillan, 1930.
3. *Minutes of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth (Extraordinary) Sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission*. Allen & Unwin, 1931.
4. *Reports on the Administration of Palestine and Trans-Jordan, 1920-1929*. H.M. Stationery Office.

NEARLY six years ago in these pages I discussed the Palestinian Problem, referred to some of its difficulties, and alluded to certain of post-war developments which had occurred.* Some of the conditions remain as they were, others have become seriously aggravated, and, in the interval, certain seeds, already sown, have brought forth unexpected fruit. For these reasons my objects here are to endeavour to throw an impartial light upon the past and present situations in Palestine, to lay stress upon some of their far-reaching complications, and to review several of the events which have thrust the British Mandate into international prominence during the last two or three years.

It may be advisable to remind my readers that whilst Palestine and Trans-Jordan, taken together, only include about 30,000 square miles, the former country, which alone concerns us here, has an area of about 10,000 square miles. It is thus larger than Wales but smaller than Belgium or Holland. With regard to the inhabitants, it was reliably calculated that, in the middle of last year, the total population of Palestine proper amounted to roughly 946,000 souls. Of these, 692,000 are Moslems, 162,000 Jews, and 92,000 Christians and others. As students in need of historical information may secure it from Dr Rappoport's book or from the 'Handbook of Palestine,' I will only say here that, with one short interval, the Turks controlled the country from the year 1516 until the British conquest, that the Moslems and

* 'Palestine—Yesterday and To-morrow,' 'The Quarterly Review,' October 1925.

Christians used to be widely divided on the basis of religion, and that various events which occurred prior to 1914 have since been claimed by the Arabs as a recognition of their rights and aspirations. From the Jewish angle Mr Sidney Dark, writing in this Review,* has recently given us an excellent account of the birth and growth of Zionism. A hundred years ago there were not more than 10,000 Jews in Palestine; in January 1839 Lord Shaftesbury wrote an anonymous article in 'The Quarterly Review' suggesting the Jewish settlement of the country and, as a result of religious and Zionist movements, there were about 85,000 members of this race in the Holy Land at the outbreak of the war. That catastrophe brought the movement to a standstill, and numbers of Jews emigrated between the years 1914 and 1918.

Ignoring the facts that Lord Allenby's leadership resulted in the capitulation of Turkey, and was therefore largely responsible for the collapse of the Central Powers, the War saw two developments of far-reaching importance to Palestine: the so-called McMahon Pledges, claimed to have been given to the Arabs in 1915, and the Balfour Declaration set out in a letter from Mr Balfour to Lord Rothschild on Nov. 2, 1917. The present importance of these events and the reasons for here referring to details familiar to most of my readers are that the Arabs claim the priority for the McMahon Pledges and argue that the Balfour Declaration and the whole policy of the Jewish National Home are improper. But the British Government have always contended that Palestine was excluded from the area intended to be independent, and this was affirmed in the White Paper † of July 1922 and by Mr Churchill, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in the House of Commons on the 11th of that month. ‡ Moreover, if the contradictory nature of the Balfour Declaration and of the McMahon Correspondence is as clear as the Arabs have since made out, surely it is curious that no definite protests were made in November 1917 or at the time of the San Remo Conference, when it was decided to give the Mandate to us. It is still more

* 'Zionism and the Jews,' 'The Quarterly Review,' January 1930.

† Cmd. 1700, 1922.

‡ 'The Times,' July 12, 1922.

remarkable that the matter of the inclusion of Palestine within an independent Arabia was never raised until it was suggested by the Emir Feisal, now King Feisal, in a conversation at the Foreign Office in January 1921.* Lastly, and perhaps most important of all, we have the authority of Mr Graves† for saying that on March 12, 1922, Sir Henry McMahon wrote a letter upon this subject to the Department most interested in Palestine. In it the ex-High Commissioner of Egypt declared that it was his original intention to exclude Palestine from the independent Arabia, and that he did not remember ever having heard anything from King Hussein giving the impression that the latter did not understand this.‡

The events of the last eleven years may conveniently be considered as falling into three periods, the first of which lasted from the inauguration of the Civil Administration on July 1, 1920, until the summer of 1928. During this time there were two High Commissioners—Sir Herbert Samuel (July 1, 1920–June 30, 1925) and Lord Plumer (Aug. 25, 1925–July 30, 1928). Soon after Sir Herbert Samuel reached Jerusalem, where there had recently been a serious outbreak in the streets, he established an Advisory Council, composed of ten official and ten non-official nominated members. Subsequently the closest attention was paid to the constitutional problem, and an Arab Delegation having come to London, the famous White Paper (already referred to and explaining the policy of the Government) was issued in July 1922. Shortly afterwards came 'The Palestine Order in Council,' § the original Advisory Council met for the last time in February 1923, and, after attempts had been made to hold elections and to further Arab participation in the Government by other means, a new Advisory Council, composed purely of official members, was appointed in December 1923. Early in 1927 Lord

* Mr Churchill stated in the House of Commons on July 11, 1922, that, so far as he was aware, no suggestion on the subject had previously been made.

† 'The Land of Three Faiths,' by Philip Graves. Cape.

‡ King Hussein died at Amman on June 4. The funeral ceremony, at the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, was the occasion of a huge demonstration, the procession being over a mile in length.

§ This Order was published in the 'Official Palestine Gazette' for Sept. 1, 1922.

Plumer introduced a wider measure of local self-government, and in June 1929 Sir John Chancellor put forward further proposals. The disturbances occurred a few weeks afterwards and the constitutional development of the country still remains at a standstill.

In the earlier years of the civil administration there were developments bearing upon public security, which developments have played a very important recent rôle in the affairs of the country. Sir Herbert Samuel found a police force and a large garrison, and, in 1921 and 1922, a unit of mounted Palestine gendarmerie, with British officers, and a battalion of British gendarmerie were raised. These measures, coupled with an improved state of public order, led to the reduction of the garrison, which at the beginning of 1925 consisted only of a regiment of cavalry, a squadron of aeroplanes, and a company of armoured cars. In April of that year the Cavalry Regiment was withdrawn; but it was decided not to put a suggested scheme of reorganisation into force until Lord Plumer had been able to form an opinion as to the defensive needs of the country. His Lordship made recommendations in the following September; and in April 1926 the two contingents of gendarmerie and the Trans-Jordan Arab Legion were abolished, parts of the former forces being absorbed in the police and a Trans-Jordan Frontier Force being formed. Consequently, from that time until the disturbances of August 1929, the safety of the country rested in the hands of one squadron of aeroplanes, one armoured car company, the Trans-Jordan Frontier Force, and a police, the native members of which proved unreliable when the time of need arrived. Lord Plumer's immense military prestige and his well-known determination to maintain order were no doubt largely responsible for securing the desired result during his tenure of office. But, in my opinion, the Permanent Mandates Commission, sitting in 1930, was entirely justified in criticising the 'excessive reduction' of the British forces.*

The second historical phase lasted from the departure of Lord Plumer, at the end of July 1928, until early in the

* See 'Minutes of the Seventeenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission,' p. 141.

autumn of the following year. It therefore includes the Wailing Wall incident of September 1928, the arrival of Sir John Chancellor as High Commissioner in December of that year, and the very serious disturbances of August 1929. As is well known, the Wailing Wall, upon which most of the recent history has depended, is a Holy Place of the utmost significance—in fact, I believe that it is the only Holy Place in Jerusalem in which both the Moslems and the Jews have a direct concern. Before and since the War disputes have arisen about its use, and in September 1928 the question was raised in an acute form, and a White Paper * was issued supporting the maintenance of the *status quo*. The Jews were disappointed, the Arabs were reassured, and the Moslems undertook building operations and introduced practices which greatly aggravated the Jews. There were rival propagandas; committees and counter committees agitated on the subject, and the two sections of the local press, particularly the Arab section, indulged in a provocative campaign. When various preliminary incidents had occurred at the Wailing Wall and elsewhere, riots began on Aug. 23, they spread to widely separated parts of the country, and, after nearly a week, order was only restored by troops summoned from Egypt. 133 Jews and 116 Arabs were killed, besides 198 Jews and 232 Arabs being seriously wounded. Twenty Arabs and one Jew were sentenced to death for their guilt in the affair, and of these three of the Arabs were hanged in June 1930, the remainder having had their sentences commuted. Thus ended events which should have been foreseen and against which earlier and more complete precautions undoubtedly should have been taken.

The third period under discussion may be said to have begun just after these disturbances; it extends to the time of writing, and it has seen the holding of a long series of inquiries and the publication of a number of Reports and other official documents. Sir John Chancellor, who had been out of Palestine since June, returned directly after the riots, and within a month the Secretary of State for the Colonies had appointed a Commission to inquire into the immediate causes of the

* Cmd. 3229.

outbreak and to make recommendations to avoid its recurrence. The Report* of this Commission, under the Chairmanship of Sir Walter Shaw, was unanimous, but it was accompanied by a Note of Reservations by Mr Snell, now Lord Snell, the representative of Labour, who was far more sympathetic to the Jews than were his colleagues. From the narrower or tactical standpoint the Report took the side of the Jews, for it decided that the outbreak was from the beginning an attack by Arabs upon Jews, that no excuse for this had been established, and that there was a wanton destruction of property. Moreover, besides several other directions in which the Jewish case was at least partially upheld, Sir Walter Shaw and his colleagues found that the Arab grievances about the Concessions granted to Mr Rutenberg, for the provision of electricity, and to Mr Novomeysky, for the extraction of salts from the Dead Sea, were unjustified. On the other hand, from the broader or strategical side the Commission clearly favoured the Arab case, especially in regard to questions of immigration, land, and constitutional development. Indeed, the general impression created was that, if the Jews had been brutally attacked, there was a good deal of justification for that attack. Whilst, therefore, the Jewish Agency published a very able reply,† the Arabs became elated and the Zionists remained dispirited as a result of what had taken place.

The first five months of 1930 saw further developments. In January the Council of the League accepted the British proposal that a special Commission should be appointed to report upon the claims and rights in connection with the Wailing Wall. That Commission, much more limited in its scope than the one provided for in Article 14 of the Mandate, and never set up, carried out its work in the summer of last year, endeavoured to bring about a friendly settlement between the interested parties, and, as this proved impossible, drew up a Report,‡ only published on June 8 last. This Report substantially confirms the regulations made by the local Administration

* Cmd. 3530.

† Memorandum on the 'Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August 1929,' by Leonard Stein.

‡ Report of the Wailing Wall Commission, 1931.

after the disturbances of 1929, and its provisions were at once enforced by a proclamation by the High Commissioner. In the same month (January 1930) Mr Dowbiggin arrived at Jerusalem to investigate the organisation of the Department of Police, and in May, when an Arab Delegation had come to London without securing any tangible results from its mission, the Government appointed Sir John Hope-Simpson to inquire into various questions in dispute. More or less concurrently Jewish immigration was temporarily restricted and a White Paper,* presented to Parliament, was forwarded to the Mandates Commission. That document approved of a large part of the Shaw Report, and stated that, for the moment, two battalions of infantry, besides units of the Air Force, would be maintained, as they are now being maintained, in Palestine.

The Report of the Mandates Commission,† accompanied by a Note from the British Government, contained 'somewhat serious criticisms' of the Mandatory Power. The partial inaction of the Government was condemned, as already stated the armed forces in the country were held not to have been sufficient to meet the case, the possibility of disturbances should have been foreseen, and better regulations should have been made for the use of the Wailing Wall. These and other reproaches were naturally resented by the British Government, and the above-mentioned Note, containing a series of explanations, was drawn up and forwarded to the Commission. When the Council met, early in September last, the Report was considered, a statement was made that the Commission had no desire to supplant the Mandatory in the exercise of its duties, and Mr Henderson, representing the British Government, expressed his appreciation of the manner in which the matter had been treated.

Sir John Hope-Simpson's Report,‡ the Statement of British Policy,§ which appeared at the same time, and the Prime Minister's Letter|| addressed to Dr Weizmann on

* Cmd. 3582.

† 'Minutes of the Seventeenth (Extraordinary) Session,' held at Geneva from June 3 to 21, 1930.

‡ Cmd. 3686.

§ Cmd. 3692.

|| For the text, see 'Parliamentary Debates,' vol. 248, No. 53, Friday, Feb. 13, 1931.

Feb. 13 last are notable developments in the history of Palestine, and they really constitute the corner stones of the situation as it exists to-day. The contents of the first two documents, issued last October, were in some ways similar and in others dissimilar. Both publications dealt with questions of immigration, land settlement and development, but their tone and sometimes their general attitude differed materially. Sir John Hope-Simpson clearly favoured the Arab cause, and he condemned a great deal which the Zionists have done. But equally clearly he endeavoured to discover the truth, and he said nothing definitely and finally to close the door to Jewish aspirations. Not so, however, with the White Paper, for that document was a somewhat offensive indictment of the Jews quite as much as a pronouncement of British policy; it went much further than Sir John Hope-Simpson's Report, and it practically disregarded the constructive suggestions made by that distinguished expert. Indeed, whilst the Arabs naturally claimed that their case had been proved, the Jews were indignant about the White Paper, British statesmen, of varying shades of opinion, joining in declaring that it inferred a policy contrary to everything which had gone before. About the same time General Smuts expressed his disapproval to the Prime Minister; there were Jewish protests from all over the world, and Dr Weizmann and the late Lord Melchett forthwith resigned the important positions which they had held in the sphere of Zionism.

The Government was unable to weather the storm. Lord Passfield at once attempted to explain the fateful words which had emanated from his Department. It was soon announced that the restrictions temporarily placed on Jewish immigration would be relaxed, and in a debate in Parliament on Nov. 17 Dr Drummond Shiels, the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, clearly showed that the Cabinet was in a more conciliatory mood. In addition, and three days earlier, the Government had invited representatives of the Jewish Agency to confer with them about various misunderstandings in regard to the White Paper. These Conferences lasted into February, and on the 13th of that month the Prime Minister wrote his famous letter to Dr Weizmann—a letter to be read 'as an authoritative interpretation of the White Paper.'

Although it contained no actual withdrawal of that document, Mr MacDonald's courteous, if not actually friendly, words carried more or less the situation back to that of the White Paper of 1922. Correctly or incorrectly it is therefore considered by both the interested parties to infer an almost complete change in the policy announced last October. Dr Weizmann at once declared that it had re-established a basis for co-operation, and discussions about the Development Scheme and the expenditure of a loan of 2,500,000*l.*, promised by the Government in November, have taken place with the Jewish Agency in London. As might be expected, the Arabs are extremely hostile to what they call the 'Black Interpretation'; Mr MacDonald is accused of once more having broken British pledges to them, and a boycott of the Jews has been threatened. So far as the Development Scheme is concerned, the Arab Executive has formulated almost impossible terms * as a condition of its support, and has opposed the sending representatives to London or taking part in any Round Table Conference with the Jews. Nevertheless, the Arab leaders have discussed matters with the High Commissioner in Jerusalem, and now, as in the earlier years of the Mandate, it is reported that certain of their leaders condemn a policy of pure obstruction. Indeed, if Parliament agrees, such a policy would be unlikely to prevent the granting of the loan, which would then tend to favour the economic position of the Jews rather than that of the Arabs. Furthermore, such a policy would prove that the Arab leaders prefer to ignore the misfortunes of their agricultural co-nationals rather than to modify their attitude of active opposition—an attitude which may have strengthened their own political power, but which, heretofore, has certainly not furthered the causes for which they claim to stand.

We now come to the meaning of the Mandate to the British people and to some of the difficulties in carrying out its unique conditions. Unquestionably the greatest imperial asset resulting from our presence in Palestine is that it prevents either a state of partial, if not complete, disorder and uncertainty due to the advent of a purely native government or the appearance, with a mandate or

* See 'The Times,' April 16, 1931.

otherwise, of some other European Power, whose presence would be a threat if not an actual danger to us. As part of this advantage we are able to protect Egypt and the Suez Canal, and, together with the special positions existing in Trans-Jordan and Iraq, we can really secure through land communications, especially air communications, with the East. Furthermore, on the moral side we have the widespread advantages of the guardianship of the Holy Land and, provided our obligations are properly carried out, of the sympathy of the Jewish world. Equally, and although British goods may not enjoy preferential treatment, the Mandate favours our trade and results in the employment of a number of British officials and police.

Although, in my opinion, these enormous assets are in no way counterbalanced, the mandate probably infringes the principle of nationalities; it may be resented by Moslems outside Palestine, and it entails a financial contribution from the British taxpayer—a contribution, however, much smaller than is generally supposed. Between the years 1921 and 1930 the British Government provided a sum amounting to more than nine million pounds sterling, and guaranteed the Palestine loan of 4,500,000*l.* raised in 1927.* But, as to its far larger amount, this British expenditure was incurred through the cost of the occupation in the earlier part of that period,† in the years immediately preceding the disturbances of August 1929, the difference in the cost of keeping the necessary forces in Palestine and elsewhere was defrayed out of the local budget, and in 1929 the Grant in Aid for the Trans-Jordan Frontier Force, our sole financial liability, had been reduced to less than 25,000*l.* In the year 1930–1931, however, owing to the general financial depression and to the necessity for increasing the police and Trans-Jordan Frontier Force,

* See 'Comments by the Mandatory Power' published with the 'Minutes of the Seventeenth (Extraordinary) Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission.' Since these comments formed a sort of justification of British policy, intended to prove that we had not ignored the needs of the country, it is probable that the sums quoted constitute a full and maximum expenditure.

† In 1921–1922 alone the cost of the garrison of Palestine and Trans-Jordan amounted to over 3,000,000*l.* See 'Report of the Shaw Commission,' p. 13.

Palestine and Trans-Jordan together cost about 400,000*l*.* On the other hand, Palestine has discharged her share of the Ottoman Public Debt, she has paid something to the Home Government for the amenities, such as railways, which remained as an outcome of the military operations, and, as is well known, she supports all her own officials, including the High Commissioner and his British Assistants. In spite of our assistance, therefore, the people have a heavy burden to bear. Taxation has naturally risen enormously since before the War, and perhaps the administration is being better carried out than is required by the less advanced section of the population. For these reasons it is of primary importance that expenditure should be curtailed, that certain departments should either have their budgets revised or be abolished, and that the total number of officials should be greatly reduced.† But it is illegitimate to suggest that the Arabs are put to an unfair expenditure for the benefit of the Jews since the weight of the taxation falls much more heavily upon the latter than upon the former section of the population.‡

The Mandate, in many ways unique, has to be considered from two standpoints. For reasons of high policy a small and poor country, with a diverse population, has been artificially divided from Syria. Furthermore, although the authority of the High Commissioner and some of the terms of the Mandate run throughout, the clauses referring to the National Home do not apply to Trans-Jordan, and since February 1928 that territory has been governed by the Emir Abdullah under a treaty with Great Britain. Notwithstanding the many obstacles,

* About 150,000*l*. of this sum was due to the greater cost of keeping extra troops, required as a result of the disturbances, in Palestine instead of elsewhere.

† Sir John Hope-Simpson, in his recent report, states that in the total budget for agriculture personal emoluments account for considerably more than ordinary expenditure, the Grant in Aid towards the culture of silk worms is 450*l*., of which the expert takes 300*l*. as salary, and in the Fisheries service personal emoluments amount to nearly 1600*l*., leaving only 700*l*. for other purposes.

‡ In the Shaw Report it is recorded that the Jews are estimated to pay 3*l*. 8*s*. 11*d*. and the Arabs 1*l*. 9*s*. 10*d*. per head in taxation. The same document declares that the Arabs have derived widespread benefits from the introduction of Jewish capital.

however, there is but little division of opinion that, from the superficial standpoint at least, British administration has brought about great improvements and that a thoroughly Western régime has been established. Compulsory military service or the tax in lieu no longer exists. Three languages—English, Arabic, and Hebrew—are recognised for all official purposes, Palestine has her own money and stamps, and the people possess a distinct nationality of their own. A great deal has been done for public health, education has been greatly improved, and the post-office is an efficient and up-to-date organisation. The railways are well run, there are hundreds of miles of road suitable for motor traffic, and, except in the several cases of actual disturbances, there has been general security. In short, to anybody who is able to compare the pre-war everyday situation with that of the present time there is no doubt that the latter is superior.

The wider and more fundamental conditions inferred by the Mandate are more difficult of realisation. There are numerous instances of Minority Treaties and special provisions for the benefit of subject peoples, but the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the provisions regarding it are unique among post-war obligations. Here the distinctive feature is that, instead of the mere protection of an existing race, arrangements are made to favour the introduction of a definite kind of settler, who is not to prejudice the civil and religious rights and the position of the other sections of the population. These arrangements have been approved by the civilised world and by the League of Nations; they cannot therefore be changed by the British people, the Arabs, or the Jews, and, as some of them certainly appear to be contradictory, they naturally create serious political and economic difficulties for the Home and Local Governments. On the whole, these difficulties have been minimised by the Zionists and increased by the Arabs. Some Jews are opposed to the whole idea of the National Home, while others, usually called the Revisionists, put forward unjustifiable claims. But it cannot be repeated too often that, in spite of severe criticism from their more extreme supporters, the leaders of the Zionist Organisation, enlarged into and renamed the Jewish Agency two years ago, and particularly Dr Weizmann, have always

recognised the widespread complications of our task and stood for the policy of the Mandate.

Although history seems to prove that their expectations were unjustified, the Arabs, on their side, are genuinely and dreadfully disappointed with the post-war situation, for their spirit of nationalism had been aroused, and they hoped for at least that kind of independence which has been established for the benefit of some of their neighbours. Moreover, whilst such misgivings may be unjustified, as I think they are, there is no doubt the majority of the inhabitants fear that Jewish prosperity will react to their commercial disadvantage and that the coming of more and more Jews, together with Jewish economic development, may eventually lead to a change in the balance of the population and to a complete Hebrew domination. These feelings, natural in themselves, have tended to unite the Moslems and the Christians, and, coupled with agitations maintained by the Press in Palestine, Syria, and Egypt, they have created fertile soil, ably cultivated by the political and religious leaders. Indeed, for the last twelve years these leaders, many of whom no longer enjoy their privileged positions possessed in Turkish times, have carried on a campaign for the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration, a change in the terms of the Mandate, and the establishment of a constitutionalism destined to enable them to control the country. This almost exclusively destructive campaign of non-co-operation has widened the gulf between the two elements of the population and has been the cause of many of the unfortunate events which have occurred since the establishment of the Mandate.

There remain the all-important questions of immigration, land, and constitutional development. Immigration and land, very closely allied, are difficult of discussion because, whereas the Reports of the Shaw Commission and of Sir John Hope-Simpson provide a great deal of information on these subjects, the cadastral survey has not yet been completed, countless factors remain unknown and many of the so-called statistics are still in dispute.* Consequently, as it is impossible to say

* For the Jewish attitude see 'The Statistical Bases of Sir John Hope-Simpson's Report.' The Jewish Agency, May 1931.

how many Jews can be admitted within any particular period, we must confine ourselves here to the realities of Jewish immigration as it has taken place, to the amount of land held by the Jews, and to the arrangements made for the protection of Arabs who have lost their lands. There are three classes of immigrants: those of independent means, those able to rely upon the support of somebody already in Palestine, and those going there in search of work. In practice no limitations have been placed upon those belonging to the first two classes, the number entering under the third category being governed by a Labour Schedule approved by the High Commissioner twice a year. At the time of the Armistice there were approximately 55,000 Jews in the country; roughly 10,000 of these people were agriculturists and about 100,000 acres of land were in Jewish hands. To-day the Jewish population amounts to 162,000; between 35,000 and 40,000 are in agricultural colonies and some 260,000 acres belong to Hebrew organisations or to Hebrew proprietors; but some of this land is in reserve, and not quite the whole of it is cultivable. Such figures mean that the proportion of Jewish land has not increased as rapidly as the Jewish population, and that the Jews now only own about their proper share of the soil.

Nobody disputes the facts that the Jews have greatly improved the lands which they own, that they have paid high prices for those lands, and that enormous sums * of Jewish money have been expended in and connected with Palestine since the War. This is an advantage to the country as a whole; it helps to defray expenses which would otherwise have to be met from British pockets, and it suits the owner, often an absentee, who has land for disposal. The position of the tenant is, however, much more serious and complicated, for clearly the Government should endeavour to safeguard his rights and to protect him from ejection until or unless he has secured some other means of livelihood. In 1920 and 1921 Ordinances were passed under which the transfer of property had to receive the assent of the Government and according to which the tenant was supposed to be provided with

* According to Jewish estimates, which are the only inclusive ones available, a sum of at least 31,500,000*l.* has been spent by the Jews in connection with or in Palestine since the War.

sufficient land for his maintenance before that consent was given. But these Ordinances did not work well, and tenants were either ejected as a preliminary to sales or induced to leave by a financial payment, and, in the latter case, having absented themselves and spent the money received as compensation, they complained of possessing no means of subsistence. Consequently, in 1929 these Ordinances were cancelled, and the cultivator was protected by the amount of notice to which he was entitled being increased and by providing for a financial recompense for disturbance, and improvements, which recompense was to be augmented in cases of long-time occupation. An 'Extraordinary' Gazette of May 29 last contains a further Ordinance for the Protection of Cultivators—an Ordinance intended to provide them with still more security. It is too soon to forecast the broader effects of this latest regulation, but it is certain that even if it proves acceptable to the tenant it will not be popular with the landlord, since the saleable value of his property will be reduced thereby.

In my opinion the attitude of the vast majority of the Arabs has not been and is not influenced by the facts that the government of the country rests directly in the hands of the Administration, and that, so far, it has not been possible to introduce any form of popular representation. In any case, however that may be, the real crux and difficulty of the problem is this. Real constitutionalism, based upon a freely and entirely elected Council or Chamber, is out of the question, because the large Arab majority would veto any further immigration, frustrate the development of the National Home, and create a situation contrary to the terms of the Mandate. For that reason the Legislative Council and the new Advisory Council, proposed in 1922-1923 and refused by the Arabs, were to be made up partly of official and partly of unofficial members. According to the suggestion, made in the White Paper of last October, corresponding measures are to be taken, and the new Legislative Council is to be composed of the High Commissioner, ten officially nominated members, and twelve elected representatives. If, as before, the twelve elected members are to be divided so that eight are Moslems, two Jews, and two Christians, then, in addition to an actual veto to be retained in the

hands of the High Commissioner or of Downing Street, the Administration will be able to secure a majority in almost any conceivable combination of circumstances. In view of the changed atmosphere created by Mr MacDonald's letter the Jews are likely to accept these proposals and to go to the poll if and when an election takes place. The Arabs will be well advised to adopt the same course, and thus to avoid the appointment of the requisite number of members to fill the places of those not elected—an appointment now proposed by the Government in order to avoid a further deadlock.

The above remarks are intended as a summary of the facts connected with the Palestine Conflict rather than as an argument in favour of or against either of the sections of the population the most closely concerned. The Jews, in a sense the plaintiffs, naturally and obviously wish to make the best of their opportunities, and some of their unofficial advocates have probably staked out future claims and employed language responsible for arousing serious apprehensions in the Arab mind. The Arabs have not only opposed the whole principle of Zionism, but they have consistently refused to co-operate with the Mandatory Administration, and they have behaved as if that Administration had been conducted in a manner intentionally hostile to them. The Government has changed or appeared to change its policy on more than one occasion, it has shown lack of foresight and strength, and it has not given satisfaction either to the Arabs or the Jews. The whole position is disputatious, immense difficulties exist for everybody concerned, and Palestine must undoubtedly figure in history for all time. A voluntary agreement would be beneficial to both sections of the population. Failure to achieve it can only be countered by a declared and well-supported governmental determination to enforce the spirit and to carry out the meaning of the Mandate.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

Art. 13.—FINANCE AND POLITICS IN AUSTRALIA.

1. *Australia*. By W. K. Hancock. Benn, 1930.
2. *Borrowing and Business in Australia*. By Gordon Wood. Oxford University Press, 1930.
3. *Australian Banking and Credit*. By R. W. G. MacKay. P. S. King, 1931.
4. *An Economic History of Australia*. By Edward Shann. Cambridge University Press, 1930.
5. *The Crisis in Australian Finance 1929-1931*. By E. O. G. Shann and W. D. Copland. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1931.

To understand the political and economic situation in Australia a series of causes must be recognised. It is usual to say that Australia is simply hard hit by one of the worst world-depressions in history. This is not the whole truth. The world-depression has affected the Commonwealth badly, but other circumstances have intensified its effect, and there are still others which stand in the way of a normal recovery. Before 1929 Australia depended largely for her prosperity on wheat and wool production. These were almost the only products she could export at a profit without subvention. The prices obtained were high, and on the whole the costs of production were low as compared with other parts of the world. But when the slump came, the prices realised fell far below the cost of production. Here was a cause of acute financial difficulty for the Commonwealth which was beyond her control. Such a crisis, however, though it would have been severe, would not have been an insuperable tax on Australia's powers of recuperation. The economic position of the individual was strong. His savings were immense, and with a small population in a huge continent, and plenty of new assets to develop, reaction was certain.

The position was, however, complicated by Australian financial policy, and especially her borrowing from abroad. The overseas indebtedness rose from 653,393,115*l.* in 1918 to 1,094,974,058*l.* in 1928. This money was spent mainly in developmental work with the object of fitting Australia to accommodate a larger population. Public opinion was almost unanimous on the necessity for

development through loan money, and if the Labour party did not favour immigration it realised that a public works loan policy created employment. The idea was encouraged by English statesmen, who conceived that Great Britain was over-populated, and money was made available for Australia at low rates of interest, so that she could take British immigrants. Australians were, in fact, involved in a borrowing cycle familiar to economists who have studied the development of new countries—a cycle in which expansion and boom and deflation follow each other in regular sequence, each operation containing the seed of the next. One characteristic of the borrowing cycle is that the importation of capital sets up speculative processes which have little to do with the main objective of borrowing, and make development more difficult. Although public works are carried out, the community finds itself in a depression in which their active value is depreciated. While it is quite probable that the distressing fluctuations of the borrowing cycle could be avoided by statesmanship, few new countries have done so. *Ex hypothesi* development precedes settlement, and successful settlement depends on the psychology and the will to succeed and the frugality of settlers—qualities which cannot be commanded and are not likely to be elicited in State schemes.

Australia suffered from an intensely severe experience of the collapse of a borrowing cycle in 1893, and for many years her leaders had been those whose youth had been passed in those hard times. Mr Bruce was young in the nineties. He had never known hardship. Politically, also, he was born under a star and attracted followers to his leadership, although there was little in it that was original. He absorbed the theory (which always conceals a borrowing cycle) that it is the duty of the State to develop, and he outlined a programme of developing 'the largest undeveloped area in the world.' But the actual expenditure lay with the States, and he determined that this national planning should be carefully thought out and controlled along scientific lines. He appointed the 'Development and Migration Commission' and the 'Commission of Scientific and Industrial Research,' and concluded the financial agreement by which borrowing was co-ordinated and controlled. The value of this

mechanism proved itself, because in 1929 Mr Bruce became aware that it was necessary to reverse policy. Although many of his seniors had been preaching this for years, he was obviously too precipitate for his party, for Parliament, and for the country, and on an appeal to the electors he was defeated. Mr Bruce has been widely blamed for the catastrophe by those who clamoured for development, and those who refused to listen to his warnings. Such criticism is unjust. There is little doubt that if Mr Bruce had been left in power he would, by orthodox financial policy, have been able to control the position and put Australia on the way to recovery. But the revolt against him was due to the reaction of a pampered democracy against economic change, and the determination of the vested interests, which had been set up during the period of expansion, to protect themselves in a readjustment. Mr Scullin scored a smashing victory after a campaign in which his campaign manager, Mr Theodore, skilfully took advantage of all these factors. He thus came into office pledged up to the hilt to the interests who were opposing Mr Bruce ; and the hampering influence of the pledges given in that political crisis has been an additional impediment to recovery since.

The important point to notice is that nearly all the factors which impede readjustment result from the intrusion of political influences into economic conditions. The fact is that in Australia the normal economic reactions are all obscured because the State occupies such a large proportion of the economic and financial field. The extent of State interference in Australia is extraordinary, and it is a pity that we do not possess a satirist like Sydney Smith to expose the absurdities to which it has led. The State undertakes the responsibility of national development ; it puts settlers on the land, builds railways, irrigation storages and channels, main and national roads, and owns the forests. A great deal of the electrical generation and distribution is in its hands as well as the Savings Banks and much of the other banking. It undertakes housing, land purchase, and resale on long terms, and makes advances to assist industry. As a matter of course all activities of a municipal character—harbours, water supply, sewerage, drainage, tramways—are undertaken by public authorities. Fiscal and wage policy

provides the coping-stone to this edifice. The tariff is fixed so that high wages can be paid, and when the costs are increased by the combined effect of tariff and industrial awards, the process is repeated. The State assists industries by bounties and loan money, and when this brings about over-production, the industry is sufficiently powerful to have arrangements legalised which make the local consumer pay for selling the export quota under cost. When this puts up internal costs, the reciprocating tariff and wage-fixing machine is put into operation again. It is not suggested that any of these schemes or policies are necessarily unsound. Each of them might well be justified separately. Moreover, a good many public utilities are run with extraordinary ability. It must be admitted, however, that when we get so large an area of the activity of the community covered by the State, the character of its life becomes different from the traditional life of a British community. The economic factors in normal activity are replaced by political factors. Political rather than economic motives count. There are, of course, many theorists in social science who justify this. We cannot pause to discuss such theories, but outline the practical effects.

The problem which Australia had to face in 1929, therefore, was, in the face of a world-wide economic crisis, to reverse a traditional policy and reduce an expanded semi-socialistic establishment into one more in accordance with the economic position. Owing to the exclusive control of the State this had all to be done in the political arena and through political action. The citizens could not do much by themselves. Every move had to be made by politicians and approved through the ballot-box. The people see in their misfortunes not the act of God or a natural convulsion, but the machinations of opponents. The State is regarded as responsible for the welfare and prosperity of the whole community. The difficulties were intensified by the fact that Mr Bruce had made an attempt—hesitating and temporising, no doubt—to reverse policy, and had failed. His opponents were, by the very consequence of victory, unable to continue the process he had started. Every section and vested interest likely to suffer had rallied round the Labour party. For political purposes the depression was

denied. Mr Bruce was a calamity howler. If things were wrong it was due to his own bad government. In reality everybody knew that the position was bad, but all the organised interests which had their roots in politics were determined that they would not suffer the first or the worst. When the Scullin Government took office late in 1929, therefore, they faced a difficult position, handicapped in the most unfortunate way by election promises and the support of vested interests. Before we proceed to explain the way in which the position was handled by them, one or two general points need elaboration.

One feature is a curious rigidity of the economic and social structure. Instead of the main cause of change being individual action and reaction, change mainly depends on the action of a politician, and he hesitates to act because the measures which are indicated are unpopular. Mr Bruce's defeat does not encourage leaders to take drastic action. On the other hand, the community seems supine. It is not discovering natural leaders. No non-government action is being taken to relieve the situation except through almost universal private economy, because all large undertakings are run by the State. There are few captains of industry, but many bureaucrats. Party politics prevent a recognition of the realities. Every party is deeply implicated in State undertakings and developmental policy, and these are breaking down. The natural thing for an opposing party to do is to make a case against that in power and as strongly and highly coloured as possible, while the natural thing for the party in power to do is to minimise the facts and put as good a face on it as possible. This leads both to concealment of the truth from the public, and inaction, because any drastic reversal of policy involves an admission of fault.

These subtle obstacles to reconstruction are, however, small compared to the obstacles caused by vested interests—interests created mainly by the system of State Socialism. Let us consider some of these.

(a) *Land Settlers*.—The individual farmer is apt to take the bad with the good, draw in his belt in bad times and suffer; but, when the State undertakes a developmental policy, and attempts to settle people on the land—

immigrants and others who would not otherwise be there—the position is different. The settler and immigrant under these circumstances regard the State as responsible for their success, and demand support and assistance and concessions in time of stress. Australian States have invested about 80,000,000*l.* in closer settlement and in soldier settlement, besides many more millions in railways, irrigation, and roads. With the slump in prices their position is difficult in the extreme. The political interest of unfortunate and disgruntled State tenants scattered over many country electorates is enormous and their demands for help are staggering.

(b) *Dependants on the Tariff*.—Most of the large-scale, efficient industries of Australia would have been content without any of the rises in the tariff during the last ten years. But the effect of the tariff on its latest levels has been to bring into operation a host of small concerns which can only succeed under boom conditions. In bad times they are in difficulties, and are perpetually agitating for further tariff protection. Being a majority in manufacturers' organisations, the small men determine policy and support the party which will promise them most. This section helped the Scullin party to victory by organisation, influence, and monetary contributions.

(c) *Public Servants*.—There are nearly 250,000 public servants in Australia, highly organised into self-conscious, aggressive, and selfish organisations. The lower paid sections are dominant, and control the policies of these organisations. Historical and other causes have brought the public service organisations into close affiliation with the Labour party. With their sympathisers and their dispersal throughout the whole electorate, their political power is immense. The last three or four Federal and State elections may be said to have been determined by their vote and openly organised influence. It seems certain that the Labour party at the Federal election gave definite pledges against salary reductions, and that this has prevented economy since.

(d) *Pensioners*.—The amount paid in old age and military pensions and in maternity bonuses per annum is 18,541,533*l.** The pension rates have been raised within

* The total number of recipients of State bounty under these heads is

the last seven years following the rise in the cost of living, but though this cost has fallen, any attempt to lower pensions would arouse a political outcry and force thousands of votes against the proponent.

(e) *Trades Unions and Wages*.—The majority of the wage-earners of the community depend on tribunals set up by the State for the fixation of wages. Moreover, it is inevitable that the trades union should be accepted as the representative of the worker, and thus its position has been strengthened. Upon the trades unions the Labour party has been founded, and thus there is a close association with the wage-fixing policy and its agents and politics, and every change in wages becomes a political matter. Alterations in real wages or merely in nominal wages can be made the ground of a political outcry in which a large proportion of the workers are directly involved. Under the circumstances the fidelity of the worker to the working-class movement is strengthened by the active agency of the union official and the Labour politician. The combination results in a political party of immense strength which, if it does not represent a majority of the community, is the most powerful organised section. Skilful organisers have built up a political machine in which the psychology of the worker, with his suspicions and repulsions, has been used. Members are bound by pledges, and restrained by conferences and vigilance committees. This leads to control by secret juntas. Though the party has no majority it is able, by an opportunist policy, to secure political power. But men of capacity and individuality are crushed out of it. Like the megatherium it has a huge and powerful body but no brains.

(f) *Federation*.—In addition to these difficulties following from the widespread intrusion of the State into economic life must be added the fact that a Federal constitution provides further obstacles to recovery. This Federal difficulty is often exaggerated, and in any case Australian geography makes it inevitable. It is almost universally believed by British people that Australia suffers from the lack of a unified Government,

609,476. But there is some duplication between military pensioners and recipients of maternity bonus, and many dependants of military pensioners have no votes.

and that uncertain policy and extravagance are only to be expected from that system. There is nothing in the suggestion as to extravagance. Parliaments in themselves are not costly, and, so far as administration is concerned, the system of States only involves that amount of decentralisation which would be necessary over a vast continent; and it is a considerable advantage from the administrative point of view that the supervision at each centre is by a responsible government responsible to an electorate, and not by bureaucrats. It is also true that the people of Australia think in their States and not in their Commonwealth. A review of Commonwealth history shows that the Federal parliament has never become a great national body concentrating on general problems, but is parochial in the worst sense, i.e. organised interests in different districts are able to secure their way through log-rolling by State representatives in the Federal Parliament. In this way the iniquitous sugar control in the interests of Queensland has been fastened on the whole of the Commonwealth. The unsoundness of Commonwealth policy is seen in the huge grants for housing and roadmaking to placate different interests by which State expenditure is duplicated. In short, Commonwealth policy displays all the weaknesses of Australian State policy, but because of the dissipation of the administration over a whole continent and with a control at a remote capital, it is more extravagant and dangerous and less subject to the control of public opinion. The defects of a Federal system seem obvious at a time of national stress. Under unification it might be possible to mobilise public opinion over the whole of Australia on right lines. But it is doubtful whether this would be the case with a central government responsible for railways, irrigation, roads, electricity, and all the other incidentals of State Socialism over a whole continent. Such a Government would be vulnerable to the highly organised vested interests created by that policy. With a *laissez-faire* tradition, unification might be a sound policy for all purposes, but with a habit of interference it would be extraordinarily dangerous. The difficulties of the outlying States of South Australia, West Australia, and Tasmania are that the Commonwealth tariff and wage standards are impossible for pioneering communities.

But the vindication of the present system is the attitude of the States towards finance. They are all obviously more in touch with realities, and willing to economise. At the celebrated Premiers' Conference of August 1930 it was the State Premiers who forced Mr Scullin to sign the agreement to balance the budgets. Anti-Labour Governments in New South Wales, Queensland, West Australia, and Tasmania had commenced drastic economies, and the economy policies of the Labour Governments of South Australia and Victoria had been most creditable in comparison with that of the Commonwealth and when weighed against the obstacles put in their way by their supporters. The defeat of Mr Bavin by Mr Lang in New South Wales, and his policy of repudiation, have intensified the situation. The strong industrial group of New South Wales has come very nearly to dominating the Federal Labour Caucus. This has been so far averted. But no other part of Australia would look at unification or any increase of Federal powers while the danger of Langism remains.

Thus handicapped, the community with all its governments has to face a financial and economic situation of truly great proportions. This must be summarised. On June 30, 1929, the accumulated deficits were 26,739,949*l*. For that year the losses on railway and other public undertakings were nearly 12,000,000*l*. These public utility losses form the kernel of the problems of State finance. They are increasing. In 1929-30 they reached 16,696,000*l*. In that year the total deficits for Australian Governments were 9,925,943*l*. and the accumulated deficits reached 33,868,840*l*. In addition to this there are losses on land settlement to be written off. The cessation of public borrowing and the collapse of the borrowing cycle had serious economic consequences. With an adverse balance of imports, and no loans, the interest payment in London is said to be 36,000,000*l*. per annum. Here was a transfer problem greater per head than that of Germany. There were also large floating liabilities in London, mainly to the Commonwealth Bank, for money advanced in anticipation of loans being raised. These interest liabilities have been kept in hand by an arrangement with the banks to pool their funds in London, and by very large exports of gold.

To meet the adverse balance, the protective instinct of Australian Governments asserted itself, and tariff increases, embargoes, and prohibitions were used with all their crudities and injustices ; while the exchange was kept at a low figure until December 1930, but severely rationed where possible. The idea of Labour Governments was to stop imports, and the necessity of stimulating exports was lost on it. Moreover, the Commonwealth Government had been living on its tariff receipts, and the embargoes, by cutting these nearly by fifty per cent., made a big hole in the Commonwealth revenue at a time when increased income taxes fail to raise higher amounts. Depression is further decreasing revenues from railways and other services, and, with the failure to reduce Government expenditure sufficiently, there is a distinct danger that Governments will fail to find the money to pay day-to-day expenses. Financial authorities are placed in the terrible dilemma of having to prevent Government breakdown by taking the money which should go to industry. Finally, the vicious circle is completed by an unemployment ratio of twenty-five per cent., which means that 200,000 to 300,000 people are idle while thousands of deeply indebted farmers are devoid of resources. It is only fair to say that the Arbitration Court has proved that in a crisis of this kind it can operate in the right direction. Money wages are down twenty-three per cent. Of this fall a portion is due to the operation of the cost-of-living adjustment machinery, and the balance is by a special reduction of real wages. This was achieved after long delay and a tremendous struggle, but the point is that it covers sheltered as well as unsheltered employments, and has been accepted.

The position of Australia was thus as acute as any debtor exporting country, but was complicated, though not irretrievably so, by the failure of politicians to face facts and cut the various Gordian knots which vested interests opposed to sound policy. It is unlikely that any of the debtor countries of the world will be able to maintain their position without some concession, and the creditor countries would be wise to get together and devise means of interest reduction and writing off, otherwise universal ruin may be the result, in which the

creditors will suffer most. But while this is so it would be unconscionable for any country to demand this or to expect any concessions while living at a higher standard than its creditor. Every thinking man realises this. It was recognised that the crucial moment for Australia was the Commonwealth budget to be delivered in July 1930. The visit of Sir Otto Niemeyer would afford a means of enabling a representative of the chief creditor nation to see what was being done to handle the situation. The history of the last nine months has centred round the failure of the Commonwealth Government to make any real attempt to cope adequately with the financial problems with which it was faced. Under the stresses occasioned by an overmastering financial crisis and minatory vested interests, the Prime Minister has vacillated, the ministry has lost its best men, and the Labour party has split into sections; but nothing has been done to put the State on to the right track.

The story of the political developments of the last eighteen months can be told shortly. Prior to the end of the financial year of 1929-30 the Federal Government had busied itself mainly with tariff matters; in the first place to redeem promises, to relieve unemployment, and then to meet the difficult exchange situation. The creation of a central Bank was, as proposed by Mr Theodore, justified by reference to financial theory; but it would have given Australia a controlling bank staffed by the Caucus Government and entirely political in control. This was prevented by the Senate, which, of course, retains an anti-socialist majority. Mr Theodore was in active preparation for some months for the event of the year—the Commonwealth budget—too busy, he said, to attend a Royal Commission in Queensland on some mining transactions at Mungana, where his honesty as Premier of Queensland was challenged. Before he delivered this budget the Commissioner reported, making the most specific allegations of improper profits having been made by him, and Mr Scullin announced his resignation. The treasury then fell to Mr Scullin, who had been rapidly demonstrating that he was completely unequal to his responsibilities. He delivered his budget on July 9. Whether this is anything like that which Mr Theodore would have delivered is not known. Mr

Theodore has always been somewhat of a man of mystery—the one man with a capacity for leadership the party has tolerated since they expelled Mr W. M. Hughes. The possession of the power of bringing off some surprising coup was credited to him by his followers of the party, while to the capitalist he posed as the only man who could keep the 'reds' in check. There is a feeling that Mr Theodore did not disclose to Mr Scullin the plan he was elaborating to save the situation.

Whether he did so or not, Mr Scullin had no plan, and the budget he brought forward was one of the most remarkable ever delivered in a time of crisis. The deficit for the year 1929–30 was 1,470,164*l.*, but revenues were falling and the prospective deficit for 1930–31 was no less than 14,218,000*l.* To make up this deficiency practically no economies were proposed, except a small amount in the Defence Department. The deficit was all to be made up by extra taxation and increased charges. Income tax and postage were increased to a small extent, and a sales tax, primage and customs duties made up about 10,000,000*l.* Public service salaries were left untouched, and as the normal increments were not affected, public servants were getting increased salaries and enjoying a diminished cost of living. Pensions were not cut, and even 'works and buildings,' an item in the budget which can always be reduced, was little affected.

Such a budget was grossly unfair to the States. The burden of Federal finance on an impoverished community meant that they were in the utmost difficulties. The Labour Premiers of Victoria and South Australia were willing to economise, but found that the head of their party absolutely refused to do so, and thus placed them in a 'bad eminence' so far as their supporters and public servants were concerned. When the Premiers met in Melbourne to hear Sir Otto Niemeyer's review of the financial and economic position, Mr Scullin was ill. He was on the point of leaving for the Imperial Conference, and his nominees as Acting Prime Minister and Acting Treasurer, Mr Fenton and Mr Lyons, represented the Commonwealth. The conference passed resolutions to square the budget within the year and make all the necessary economies for that purpose. Messrs Lyons and

Fenton could not bind the Prime Minister, and it was with great difficulty that he could be induced to attend. When he did come he took the line of least resistance, and signed. The decision to balance the budgets within a year was probably a mistake. To attempt the impossible was to prevent the possible from being accomplished. It is not suggested that the situation should be temporised with, but if the facts had been faced and appreciated they would have shown that to put a burden on the community sufficiently heavy to balance the budgets within a year would have brought widespread losses. If there had been a three-year plan based on severe economies, complete cessation of loans and as small an increase of taxation as possible, recuperation would not have been a matter of extreme difficulty.* The State Premiers went back to their States and brought in budgets which attempted to meet the situation so far as could be without stability in Federal policy. But the Labour machines in Victoria and South Australia presented strong obstacles to economy. Mr Hogan and Mr Hill were getting into a position of antagonism with the machine in which expulsion was threatened. South Australia made a creditable reduction in public expenditure. In Victoria, reduction of salaries was brought about by a graduated tax in which the inadequate salaries of the professional heads, the tall poppies, were cut drastically. It is not suggested that the State budgets were satisfactory, but they were better than the Federal.

Messrs Lyons and Fenton took the Premiers' agreement to the Federal Caucus and were reluctantly forced by a majority to postpone its consideration until after the New South Wales election. The object was plain. The party was to sit on the fence until they saw how the cat jumped in New South Wales. The opponents of sound finance were to make the New South Wales election a test. Then followed a contest in which the typical influences of Australian public life were displayed at their worst. It showed the almost supine attitude of the

* This statement is made without any definite knowledge of what Sir Otto Niemeyer was prepared to offer in the way of assistance if the budget were balanced.

middle classes, querulous with their leaders, visiting on them the consequences of their own apathy; the disgruntled wealthy classes groaning under discriminatory taxation and cursing all politicians; predatory vested interests like the manufacturers realising that Labour was the only hope for still higher duties, and rewarding the State party for what the Federal party had done; the public servants openly organising against Mr Bavin, the Premier, who had reduced their wages and lengthened their hours; the struggling farmers clutching at any straw. Mr Bavin is a highly educated University man, an eminent lawyer, penetrated by the typical British ideas of political responsibility, fanatically honest. Being a gentleman he is a lonely figure in politics, and he lacked the 'hail-fellow' attitude of the typical politician. He would promise nothing but to carry out the Premiers' agreement. In Mr Lang the Labour machine has a man exactly suited to its desires. He has no intellectual attitude except to carry out the orders of the juntas in control. He is completely reckless and has no inhibitions. His enormous strength in the movement is due to the fact that, unlike other Labour leaders, he has never quailed before the problems of economic policy. He has no economic policy of his own, but is always willing to 'hack his way through.' He is not loved, has no magnetism, but is dynamic and energetic, and has never been suspected of venality. Unlike Mr Bavin he promised everything. The farmers were encouraged to believe they would get 5s. a bushel for their wheat; public service salaries and short hours would be restored; loans could be raised to keep everything going. Repudiation was naturally denounced, and extremists who preached it were silenced. The stories of depression were a capitalistic plot and the Premiers' agreement was dictated by the agents of the bondholders. It is not necessary to assume that the people of New South Wales believed this rhodomontade. But every election in the last four years has gone against the Government in power. The organised vested interests played the crucial part. They were small minorities, but a compact minority is worth far more than a dissipated majority, and Mr Lang scored a crushing victory.

Several of the Federal ministers fought for Mr Lang against the agreement the Prime Minister had signed,

and when Messrs Lyons and Fenton met the Caucus in November they found the New South Wales group, including Mr Theodore, in charge. By this time it was clear that Mr Scullin's budget estimate was 'optimistic.' The financial statement presented by Mr Lyons showed that even with the additional taxation of Mr Scullin there would be a deficit of 11,000,000*l*. He had proposed drastic economies to the caucus, but these were summarily rejected, and he was only able to bring before the House a lame scheme which proposed to divert 2,000,000*l*. from the sinking fund payments and 3,700,000*l*. additional taxation. The only step towards public service reduction was a tax on salaries of over 750*l*. Recipients of such salaries might be expected to vote against Labour. A number of wild-cat schemes in which Mr Theodore was prominent were discussed, the main idea of which was inflation. On Dec. 15, 1930, loans of 28,000,000*l*. were due and it was necessary to provide for this. Messrs Lyons and Fenton proposed to appeal to the patriotism of the people for a renewal, but the Caucus passed a resolution to postpone payment. The two responsible ministers then showed their mettle, defied the Caucus, and with the assistance of public men of other shades of opinion went on with the loan and it was over-subscribed.

Mr Scullin from a distance of 12,000 miles sent frantic telegrams protesting against the way in which his deputies were being treated, and if on his return he had ranged himself on their side he would have retained the respect of the whole community, and indeed got its enthusiastic support. A small amount of courage would have dissipated the cowardly group which had sat on the fence until after the New South Wales election. The community were, therefore, aghast when Mr Scullin's first step was to take back to the treasury the man whose honour had been impugned—the man who had been a thorn in Mr Lyons' side during his absence, Mr Theodore. This was probably due to the fatuous idea that Mr Theodore had some magical plan which would put things right, or at any rate provide money which would be useful if an election were forced. On the restoration of Mr Theodore, Mr Lyons, Mr Fenton, and several other Labour men resigned from the party, a step which, considering the risks they took with the machine, impressed the community

strongly. Meanwhile, Mr Lang in New South Wales was unable to carry out any of his promises except to restore salaries and reduce hours in certain public services. He could raise no loans whatever. He took refuge in a constitutional fight, and tried to abolish the Legislative Council. This was thwarted by Mr Bavin's measure, which directed a referendum on an alteration of the constitution. The financial position of New South Wales was acute, and it was only finance provided by the Commonwealth Bank which kept her going, and this was money withdrawn from enterprise all over the continent.

Mr Theodore's scheme was to issue a fiduciary currency of 18,000,000*l.* notes, some 6,000,000*l.* of which was to be used for advances to farmers. Controlled inflation (not necessarily currency inflation) was advised by certain economists who relied on Mr J. M. Keynes as an authority. Their advice, however, was always conditioned by stipulations that Government expenditure and real wages should be substantially reduced. Mr Theodore was willing to accept these stipulations, but was vetoed by the Prime Minister. At about the same time Mr Lang announced a policy of compulsory reduction of interest on overseas loans as his solution of the difficulty. He said if this were not done, default was inevitable. This was true if neither Government expenditure nor the private expenditure of the masses was to be touched. It was also true that concessions had to be made by creditors to debtors. But this should not be done either by the indiscriminate issue of credit or the indiscriminate freeing of revenue by repudiation. The adjustment by writing off and controlled deflation should be done through financial institutions with knowledge of the avenues available and the persons who could profit by it. There were movements in this direction in unofficial channels, but they were embarrassed by the two unsound rival political projects. Mr Keynes is quoted as if he were the modern successor of Mr Henry George and Major Douglas with a plan which will dispense with sacrifice, painful re-organisation and hard work, and if he were in Australia he would be asking to be saved from his friends. His followers insist on controlled inflation as a means of readjusting the burdens of depression on the lines of justice, and freeing the active elements in

order to recommence enterprise. That might be sound if applied to a community which had been frugal but had been suddenly struck with a financial disaster. To apply it to a community which has been inflating for years without introducing the corrective force of economy must be unsound. In any case, Mr Theodore is only using such phases of the inflationary theory as suit his purpose, and his plan is simply a means of dissipating further resources for electioneering purposes.

In the meantime Mr Lang's scheme has matured into the positive repudiation of overseas, and, it is understood, local interest. It seems clear that Mr Lang intends his scheme as a rival to Mr Theodore's fiduciary issue, and it is intended as an attempt by the group which he represents to dominate the Commonwealth. Mr Lang is making a tour through Australia to propagate his plan, and it is said that he will enter Federal politics and try to oust Mr Theodore and Mr Scullin. Mr Theodore has, therefore, from being the agent of the extremists when out of office, become their main enemy while in office. Though the New South Wales section dominated the Federal political Caucus for a while, the rivalry between Mr Lang and Mr Theodore has caused a re-grouping and a polarisation. The two sections quarrelled over two by-elections in Sydney, one of which brought a Labour reverse and the other a very much reduced majority. The Labour machine in Sydney is now engaged in excommunicating all the followers of the Prime Minister, and about six New South Wales Federal members are with this group. In the Federal Labour party Messrs Scullin and Theodore are supreme, and they are excommunicating Mr Lang's followers from the Federal Caucus. The original Labour party of six months ago is, therefore, split up into three sections. The Lyons group of seceders is voting to defeat the Government, and if at any time the New South Wales extremists vote against it, it will be defeated. The Fiduciary Currency Bill has passed the Representatives, and been rejected by the Senate. If it is repassed and rejected again a double dissolution can be obtained. The Government will probably delay their defeat in order to see that the Senate as well as the House is dissolved.

The people of Australia, therefore, find themselves
Vol. 257.—No. 509.

with two plans before them, sponsored by politicians for whom they have little respect. One of these plans is plainly dishonest; the other, if not dishonest, is, when judged by every historical standard, extraordinarily dangerous. Both make an appeal because it is almost impossible to see a solution without some concession by creditors to debtors. Mr Lang's plan recognises this, but its crudity will precipitate disaster. Mr Theodore's plan might be of value if inflation could be controlled. But an atmosphere of confidence is necessary for such control, and there can be no confidence in Mr Theodore. In both plans, also, we see the old idea, which has done such harm, that the politician is bound to come along at every crisis and propound a plan for relieving the people of trouble and suffering and cancel the consequences of their own folly. The fact is that a plan which conceals and cancels this suffering is not the plan which Australia needs. The Commonwealth must face the facts and take whatever suffering is involved. Any form of relief—inflation or otherwise—without readjustment and discipline would simply mean a dissipation of the last resources, and leave the difficulties as far as ever from solution.

There is, however, every chance that Mr Lyons will be able to represent this view. He is simple, direct, and has captured the imagination of the people in several States. As a man who has left a party he appeals to the strong antipathy to party which exists—a position which has, of course, elements of danger. It is probable that he will lead the opposition forces at an election. He will not carry many Labour votes, or those of the vested interests; but he will organise, as no other man could do, the vote which is unattached and generally determines elections. There is strong evidence that he is disillusioned by the difficulties of State socialism, and impressed with the necessity of freedom for enterprise. But the experience of another ex-Labour leader, Mr W. M. Hughes, was that he fastened on all non-Labour parties a good many socialistic measures which have done most of the harm that we are now experiencing. Whether Mr Lyons and his new colleagues will be willing or able to free Australia from the complex of State regulation and the vested interests it implies is a matter for the future to decide.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

Excursions in Asia—Politics in Russia—William Archer—Lord Kilbracken—‘Dress, Drinks and Drums’—Patagonia—‘Life’—‘Equality’—Peace Tactics of Napoleon—Sir Francis Burdett—Unemployment—Dreyfus—‘The Endless Adventure’—Culloden—Marlowe—Burlesque and Parody—Siamese Tales—King Arthur in Italy—‘Pauline’—Two Novels—‘Music Come to Earth’—Environment—Correspondence.

EARLY in this year Mr Bertram Thomas traversed successfully a part of Arabia, the Rub’ al Khali, which probably had never before been crossed by man, certainly not by any other than a follower of the Prophet. In **‘Alarms and Excursions in Arabia’** (Allen and Unwin) he describes his first visit to that lost chapter of the world, and suggests the difficulties that had guarded it against explorers. That is, however, but one part of a revealing book, and the least important part; for earlier we have accounts of the trials and troubles, dangers also, encountered by a British political officer in Iraq and Arabia when dealing with the wild, free men of the marshes and the wilderness. Mr Thomas’s description of how he was surrounded by enemy tribes in Mesopotamia, with only a few natives and one Englishman to help him, until he was rescued by aeroplane, to return and restore the position later, is worthy to be added to the records of courage and duty-done that have brought honour to the British name. It was an instance of touch-and-go, and illustrates the debt that we owe to the men who are at work for the Empire overseas. And not only the men are winning the laurels of achievement. The tribute of Sir Percy Sykes to Mrs Rosita Forbes in his Introduction to her **‘Conflict’** (Cassells)—‘a gallant explorer, who is gifted with deep insight into the mind of the Oriental’—its readers will cordially endorse. Her adventure in travelling from Angora to Afghanistan, by way of Palestine, Iraq, and Persia, and returning along the Russian frontier through Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, was in itself a feat of considerable endurance and courage; but throughout the countries visited she observed, inquired, and noted, and therefore has much that is useful to say—especially

about the hopes and methods of the Soviet government in the East. What she and Sir Percy Sykes testify is significant; for the most ancient part of the world that she traversed—the greatest empires within those regions having risen, shone, fallen and disappeared—is also, in a way, the newest part of the world, inasmuch as on the bases of the present a future of immeasurable possibilities is in process of being established.

An interesting addition has been made to the number of books on Russia, with '*Glimpses at High Politics*' by N. V. Charykow (Allen and Unwin), who describes himself as 'Serf-owner, ambassador, exile.' That is really an able summary. The author was born into a wealthy serf-owning family, who had much to do with the development of trans-Ural Russia. Even after the emancipation of the serfs, the family carried on in a semi-patriarchal way till time and changes of methods of government at the centre, resulting in the lessening of responsibility and of suitable occupation for the landed nobility of the provinces, gradually undermined the old system. M. Charykow was by turn reformer, soldier (seeing active service against Turkey), political agent, with eminently successful results in Turkestan, Ambassador, and finally acting Foreign Minister, when the clouds were gathering before the final crash. In the crash he was naturally involved as being part of the old régime, and he spent the remainder of his life in exile. He was of the best type of far-seeing and reforming official which Russia sadly lacked. If there had been more like him and they had been given power, the story of Russia must have been different from what it is.

'I used to think that no one on earth read the "Quarterly," but I now hear that John Murray does, and that in two or three large asylums it is read aloud to the lunatics in bed.' Not even wild horses shall compel us to reveal the famous name of the Quarterly Reviewer who wrote to another Quarterly Reviewer those impious, amusing, and howlingly inaccurate words; but they are too rich not to quote from '*William Archer*' (Allen and Unwin), whose biography has been excellently written by Colonel C. Archer, his brother. It was impossible for those admitted to the confidence of Archer not to realise the simple exaltation of his spirit with its earnest and

practical serviceableness. Yet so modestly reserved was he that those who knew him little could hardly know him at all; and to them this intimate book will bring revelation. As dramatic critic and essayist, as the playwright of 'The Green Goddess,' as an humanitarian free from 'isms' but active in works, he touched life helpfully at many angles; and with all his cosmopolitan interests remained true English, as every stress of national climax proved. Here is a revealing confession of what came to him when he was serving as a Volunteer at the time of the Boer War:

'As I lay "slimly" ensconced the other day, behind a furze-clump on a windy upland, waiting for a word of command, and looking down upon a grey cathedral city among the green water-meads of the valley below, I realized clearly that it was no process of political thought that had brought me there, but sheer unreasoning love for this beautiful, this reverend, this illustrious land, mother of nations, and fountain-head of that speech which, ennobled by a peerless company of poets, is to-day on the lips of freemen all around the globe.'

At last, after fifteen years, Lord Kilbracken has been persuaded to give to the public the privately-circulated '**Reminiscences**' (Macmillan) which he wrote in 1916. Public memory is short and Civil Servants do not court the limelight, so that many will not remember the work done by Sir Arthur Godley (as he then was) as Permanent Under-Secretary at the India Office or previously as private secretary to Mr Gladstone. Lord Kilbracken is appropriately modest about his own achievements, but he gives us delightful impressions of those with whom he worked. Foremost, of course, is Mr Gladstone, but we also are shown much of Archbishop Temple and Jowett; civil servants like Lingen and Welby; statesmen and politicians like Lord Granville, Randolph Churchill, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and various Secretaries of State for India. He is naturally to some extent a hero worshipper, but is not undiscerning. He sees the limitations of his heroes as well as their qualities, and his sense of humour is never lost—in that he is unlike Gladstone whose earnestness caused his sense of humour to be capricious and at times formidably absent. We are given an interesting example of King Edward's foresight in regard to Germany

in 1870, and some graphic accounts of ceremonies and scenes in Parliament and elsewhere. There are many good stories in the book, and our only regret is that it stops in 1916.

The late Ernest Crawley was an indefatigable seeker after the facts of social anthropology, and before his premature death in 1924 had established himself as an authority in that branch of science. Two years ago we reviewed with the commendation due his '*Studies of Savages and Sex*,' and now welcome these further studies, again edited by Dr Theodore Besterman, and published under the engaging but discordant title of '*Dress, Drinks and Drums*' (Methuen). As is to be expected, these subjects prove to be entirely distinct one from another; while the mass of curious details under each of the three heads is sufficient for a trinity of volumes. Compression has not proved helpful, and the catalogue of practices and circumstances lumped together would have been more informing had they been combined with more general classifications, comments, and explanations. The volume is rather a garnering of diverse material on which anthropologists may work than a coherent book. Within its limits, however, it contains plenty of food for thought. In much the same way as with '*Dress, Drinks and Drums*,' '*A Yankee in Patagonia*' (Heffer: Cambridge) has masses of facts, on this occasion about wild life and ranch life in South America, so abundant and compact that it needs the leaven of illuminating comment to make it companionable. If only W. H. Hudson were here to turn this haystack into literature! Its compilers, Robert and Katharine Barrett, have undoubtedly given pains and devotion to it, writing down all that their Yankee friend, Edward Chace, told them of his thirty-three Patagonian years, but an amassing of facts is not enough to make a volume readable. Dipped into, the book has much that informs and amuses, but mere glimpses are not enough, and a little order and imagination spent on writing it out would have made it far more acceptable.

If and when opportunity serves we shall hope to revert at more adequate length to the two full and colossal volumes, '*Life: Outlines of General Biology*' (Williams and Norgate), which, after immeasurable thought and research in the widest provinces of scientific study,

Sir J. Arthur Thomson and Professor Patrick Geddes have produced; though, indeed, a full-length article still would be inadequate for this work. Those authors, practised as well as learned and enthusiastic collaborators, have enlarged the region of biology to far beyond the usual limits, and bring into its scope such inquiries as are expressed by General Smuts's 'Holism' and the far-reaching theories of Einstein, at the same time as they do not overlook 'the dogfish and the bean plant' of the student-guide, who steps on to their carpet significantly when they are treating of the neglect of biology in the universities of the Empire. These volumes are for the student at large as well as for the seeker among the classes. A text-book truly, but how much more than that—for they contain a rich human philosophy and even a hopeful outlook as they reveal the facts of life and the spiritual possibilities latent within them. We shall not be surprised if for students of the right quality of mind this will come to be regarded as an epoch-making work.

In our April issue we reviewed '**Account Rendered**,' by that convinced and energetic individualist, Sir Ernest Benn. We now have occasion to notice a very different work, '**Equality**' (Allen and Unwin), by that equally convinced and energetic Socialist, Dr R. H. Tawney. To speak in parable, we might say that, if two countries desiring inter-communication were separated by a chain of mountains, Sir Ernest would exclaim, 'Leave the mountains alone. Any man worthy of the name can find his way over them and be the better citizen for so doing. The weaklings must stay at home;' whereas Dr Tawney would answer, 'No. Nature has made a mistake. We must level the mountains and fill up the valleys, so that all, even in bathchairs, may have equal chances of getting over.' The moderate man, however, says, 'Let us rather make roads round the hills and bridge the valleys. Let us leave the direct route by the peaks to the stalwart, but give the average man a reasonable chance, even though the gradients be too steep for bathchairs.' Dr Tawney writes with such zeal, brightness of phase and erudition that it is hard not to be swept along by him; but he is compelled to admit that, as things are, most people do not call for equality because they love it, but because they are underneath and want to be on top. If they get there, we

have no further talk from them of 'equality.' We are all equal before the law, says Dr Tawney, so why not in other things : in opportunities, in education, in recreation, in work, in housing. The analogy is unfair. We all can be equal before the law because our personalities, characters, and desires then matter nothing. He admits that equality of income is unworkable ; yet how ideal it would be, he says, for the State to take every man's surplus income and use it for the best interests of the community. How blessed, indeed, is heavy taxation—let us, therefore, increase that blessing ! We shudder at the prospect of Dr Tawney's ideal State, unless he first changes human nature, which abhors equality, and secondly proves that government administration is beneficial and economical. He must also establish his implied conviction that all rich men under present conditions are either knaves or fools in the disposal of their money. This is an interesting book, which challenges thought, but we cannot accept its conclusions.

No student of the workings of the diplomatic mind of Napoleon, his visionary schemes, his utter unscrupulousness, can afford to ignore Mr H. Butterfield's full and thoughtful study of **'The Peace Tactics of Napoleon, 1806-1808'** (Cambridge University Press). With the plodding industry of the scrupulous historian, he has described the condition of a distracted Europe during those two critical years in facing 'that monster, choked out of hell, formed by Beelzebub to be the scourge of the earth,' as the Tsar Alexander, in his ardent hatred, dubbed the Corsican destroyer. Also he has leavened his seriousness with personal sketches, such as those of Canning, Talleyrand, and Blucher, that illuminate the narrative brilliantly. He brings out well the essential insincerity of Napoleon and the frequent folly that eventually brought him to crash after having bled France white. The conqueror of the hour, he could with prudence and far-sightedness have ensured his position ; but there was no end to his gambling greed and cupidity. He played on the weaknesses of the Coalition ; Austria wavering, Prussia broken, England as ever slothful till finally roused, and the Swedish King Gustavus's eccentricities, while flattering Russia. His best card in this great game of bluff was played at Tilsit. Why should not

Russia have the East, 'the empire of mosque and minaret,' while France worked her will in Western Europe? Happily the scheme failed, as it was bound to do, and seven years afterwards the Conqueror had lost his throne.

The testimony of Benjamin Disraeli, 'I think Sir Francis Burdett was the greatest gentleman I ever knew,' is itself an allurement to the political portrait that Mr M. W. Patterson has penned in '**Sir Francis Burdett and his Times**' (Macmillan). 'Political portrait,' we emphasise, for the author has barely touched on the glowing social and country life lived by the great Tory-Radical; and that is something of a pity, as it spoils the completeness of a fine biography. And it might easily have been done, judging from the glimpse given towards the end of Burdett's social activities, if Mr Patterson had kept out much that is hardly germane to his subject; as, for example, the accounts of Mrs Fitzherbert and Lady Augusta Murray and the needlessly long descriptions of Horne Tooke, and some others who played their important subordinate parts with Burdett in the bitter and long-drawn drama of social and parliamentary reform to which the seventy years of this narration were given. We must not, however, overdo this aspect of our criticism, for these volumes are an excellent piece of work, detailing the crucial years that saw revolution tearing to pieces parts of Europe and threatening England, happily avoided here by concessions that were barely in time. With all his faults, over which Mr Patterson is frank, Burdett was a great man, and if because of his frequent rancour in that angry political business and his sometimes ungracious attitude towards his proved friend, Thomas Coutts, he may not have justified Disraeli's tribute, we still can remember that he lived in difficult times and that his work for the eternal underdog was unfaltering.

Two volumes, recently published by the House of Longman, are of real help in considering the supreme social and industrial problem of these days—Unemployment. The first, by Mr H. A. Marquand, '**The Dynamics of Industrial Combination**,' is pretty severe reading; but no question of industrial re-organisation can be regarded as easy-going. Chief among the author's purposes is it to show what Finance can do in re-establishing the success of industry. As illustrating something of

the necessity of Mr Marquand's treatment of present industrial ills, Sir William Beveridge's comprehensive work on '**Unemployment**' gives ample instances. For more than twenty years, with the war meanwhile upsetting organisations and prospects almost hopelessly, this work has been on the stocks; while its publication at this juncture is invaluable. As the author shows—and who that is observant of facts does not know it?—much must be done before better and happier prospects return to British industry; but what is needed, as Sir William effectively points out, is brainwork, organisation, energy for the difficulties confronting us, and recognition that their solution is merely human, 'a problem of industry, not an Act of God.' As Hercules showed to the carter, not divine intervention is called for, but a shoulder to the wheel. And how much depends on the Trades Unions themselves! If only they would be less political and would resume their former functions of fitting their members for their tasks. How can industry recover while 'ca' canny' is a motive, shorter hours a supreme desire, and training and apprenticeship are not encouraged? The question, however, bristles with difficulties, as this excellent work shows.

It was inevitable, and very desirable, that in course of time the true history, so far as inevitable prejudice permits, of '**The Dreyfus Affair**' (Heinemann) should be written; and now the time has come and the book. M. Jacques Kayser, the nephew of Dreyfus, has the necessary authority and an excellent translator for his task. A sordid, dramatic, almost a dreadful story is this, which almost broke France and shocked lovers of justice all the world over from the hour of that formal degradation at Rennes in 1895 and the imprisonment on Devil's Island, followed by the wholesale lying and suffering and gradual disclosure of the truth. Happily, some measure of justice was done to Captain Dreyfus before too late; but the affair left wounds not only in the fair spirit of France. An interesting impression of the affair also comes from Germany. Herr Walther Steinthal's '**Dreyfus**' (Allen and Unwin), although not so well documented as the previous book, is fresh and striking. It brings out the moving drama of it with force and colour.

In contrast to the mass of indifferent books which make

their appearance nowadays, it is a pleasure and relief to come across one by a writer like Mr F. S. Oliver. The high quality of the first volume of '**The Endless Adventure**' has been abundantly maintained in the second, 1727-1735, just published by Messrs Macmillan. This is the writing of history at its best, interesting, vital, with brilliancy of expression and enough prejudice to give spice—for unprejudiced history is almost invariably dull. The pen portraits of George II, Queen Caroline, and Walpole, and his friends and enemies are vivid. There is a fascination about the endless adventure of governing men. That at times the morality of that adventure is low and the manœuvres to keep power not conspicuously honourable in no way detract from the attractiveness of the reading. The main theme of this volume is the alliance between Walpole and Queen Caroline, an alliance which, through its skilful management of the King and the outwitting of political opponents, brought security and prosperity to England at a time when they were needed. The Queen's death, in ending that alliance, was a greater blow than even Walpole realised, and eventually led to his fall. The subject and the period give Mr Oliver scope for his musings on man as a political animal.

With the fifth volume the series of '**More Culloden Papers**' (Robert Carruthers: Inverness), edited by Mr Duncan Warrand, comes to an end, and has well earned the gratitude of students of the '45, although its general effect is to reduce the supposed romanticism of what was on the whole a drab and desultory affair. Had the Government, through its soldiers and statesmen, after their triumph at Culloden, acted with a prudent gentleness, the rising probably would have lost all the glamour that has attached to it. This volume tells, in glimpses, a sad story of muddle, confusion, and inefficiency on both sides in the concluding months; and brings out especially the want of vision of the leaders of the Hanoverian cause and the harshness, due doubtless to necessity, of Lord Cromartie, the Young Pretender's general, in harassing the tenancies in Scotland for moneys and supplies. Of Prince Charlie himself, during those months, we have the briefest glimpse, and not a pretty one; when he was in flight and desperate for succour and shelter, in 'visible distress, for he was maigre, ill-coloured

and overrun with the scab,' thereby revising for the worse some romantic visions. Now that this informing series of historic correspondence has been brought to a close, we hope the editor will compress and bring it together in one or two effective volumes. It is invaluable for the chapter of Scottish gallantry and loyalty that it relates.

The definitive edition of the works of Marlowe, published by Messrs Methuen and 'generally' edited by Professor R. H. Case, has already become established as the only thorough and authoritative one likely to be published. Its third volume, containing '**The Jew of Malta**' and '**The Massacre of Paris**,' edited by Mr H. S. Bennett, maintains the excellence of the series. The task of this editor has been unusually difficult because of the corruption of the texts and the extraordinary unevenness of Marlowe's workmanship, especially in the '**Jew**'; but he has done all that scholarship and common-sense can do, with apt suggestions and parallels, to make up for the essential weaknesses of these plays. We pass from the particular to the general. A more complete survey of '**Burlesque and Parody in English**' (Oliver and Boyd) than this which has come from the enthusiasm of Dr George Kitchen can hardly be possible. Beginning with the Middle Ages it traces the progress and notes the varying character of parody from its beginning in England to the present, linking together, let us say, Chaucer with Mr Kean Seymour, and bringing within that all but infinite span examples that make amusement. Yet not only amusement, for Dr Kitchen rightly has recognised burlesque 'as a serious art, a long-established mode of criticism, which is often far more incisive, and certainly more economical than the heavy review'; and therefore while this is a happy book for recreation it also has its purpose and its place on the shelf of English literature.

To more thoughtful readers the best part of '**Siamese Tales Old and New**' (Noel Douglas) will be the concluding reflections made by the translator, Mr Reginald le May, whose years of service spent in association with the Government of Siam gives him a special right to speak. The fifteen stories are, of course, most diverse in their appeal, but it is a little awkward or at least a revelation of the inadequacies of language, to refer to some of them as Chaucerian in kind; for any comparison

made between these characteristic tales of the East and others of our English genius is bound to cause strain. At any rate, we can praise and welcome this volume, not only because its tales are excellent as fiction but for the reason that they reveal something of the workings and the curious fascination to Europeans of the cultured Siamese mind. From East to West: from now to the past of the Celtic twilight. Although it was to be expected that the cycle of Arthurian legends should have made some impression on the romantic minds of the Italians, it is curious, even surprising, to discover from Dr Edmund G. Gardner's '**The Arthurian Legend in Italian Literature**' (Dent) how deeply and frequently that Celtic cycle has penetrated poetry and romance there. The modifications are interesting, especially when it is seen—despite the significant glimpse through the story of Lancelot in the incident of Paolo and Francesca in the '*Divine Comedy*'—that not he but Tristram was the particular hero of the Italian aspects of the legends. Dr Gardner's books are never exactly light reading, and this, with its generous detail, in that respect is very like the rest; but yet it is full, scholarly and necessary, as opening a new vista of literary interest. Remembering the famous earliest published one-word criticism of the poem and the doubt as to its worth so often expressed by Robert Browning, it is curious to see this reprint, edited by Mr N. Hardy Wills, of '**Pauline**' (University of London Press) containing textual comparisons with the two later editions. Was it worth while? For this reason, yes; that it is a genuine expression of the true Browning. Amid its characteristic confusions and turgidities, passages of force and characteristic sincerity, there is frequently a glimpse of the writer of '*The Ring and the Book*' and '*Asolando*'; but on the whole it is not an excellent poem. On that dead verse this poet rose to far higher things, and only because it is such a stepping-stone has '**Pauline**' its interest to the present generation.

To turn, in brevity, to the fiction that refreshes. Miss E. M. Delafield's '**Challenge to Clarissa**' (Macmillan) is good comedy and entirely delightful. Though less subtle than that of the author of '*Elizabeth*' her work, in its humour, wit, and study of life, belongs to much the same province as that lady's. Clarissa is a militant

mother, with the power of the purse in her own possession and the coarseness of fibre which enables her to use it for the subjection of others. Then, as should be in all well-brought-up fiction, the tyrant over-reaches herself and when challenged in her dearest department, has to cover her defeat with concessions. By clear well-pointed touches Miss Delafield has drawn a generous gallery of characters—her Lawrence being the only uncertainty—and out of their follies and reactions has written a book of unfaltering zest and enjoyment. Lord Dunsany with **'The Travel Tales of Mr Joseph Jorkens'** (Putnam) has far more ambition in his purposes, aspiring sometimes to the regions of the divinely absurd. His Mr Jorkens is an excellent creation, a traveller with the imagination or luck of a Munchausen, who has seen weird and wonderful things, and fortunately described them to this author. The detailed characterisation of Joseph Jorkens is in itself a minor victory. The quality of the tales varies, as is only to be expected when mermaids and witches are about. Those of Jembu the cricketer, and of Mrs Jorkens are first-rate, while that of **'Our Distant Cousins'** has the touch of genius always to be unexpectedly expected in Lord Dunsany's best fiction, to which the volume nearly, but not quite, belongs.

Of all artists, musicians appear to take their art and profession most seriously; while, to those of them who loudest talk of it, it is as the voice of the gods, though often, the undevout must feel, a voice, while capable of supreme beauty, degraded to a pretentious ugliness, sentimentality or silliness, while surely its modernists are the most blatant of the widespread cult of incompetence in the arts. Since the War the conditions have altered immeasurably, so that the late Professor Adolf Weissmann's **'Music Come to Earth'** (Dent) is helpful as well as shrewd and jolly. His pen has a point, yet sometimes it is a bludgeon. Occasionally, as is natural in so frank a work, he overstates or misstates; but on the whole what he says is true and refreshing in its outspokenness. Before the War music had grown largely mechanical owing to the dominance of the piano and the eager fumbling fingers of those who **'practised.'** After the War came Jazz, wittily described by Herr Weissmann as the **'glorification of a mechanical and highly organised**

traffic, the manifestations of which denote the dethronement of personality, the extinction of individuality, and the derision of imagination,' with the saxophone and the banjo the dominating instruments. And every day the changes come more rapidly as the effects of broadcasting grow. Through radio, while music has become further mechanised, the hungry public at the same time have learnt something of what is good and eternal.

Mr J. A. Douglas Parker's '**Environment, the Key of Life**' (Alphac Publishing Centre), makes such enormous claims on the faith and credulity of its readers that we are unable to accept many of its conclusions, but it is so honest and sincere that even its extraordinary assertions may at least be hearkened to. Not only was this work, we are told, called for by Jesus Christ, who is again a 'Master' in the world, but the post-mortem Mrs Eddy revises in it some of her extreme statements made when alive, and the late Professor Drummond, Madame Guyon, and a visitor from Jupiter, named 'Galahad,' have given encouragement and counsel to the writer. One statement, however, shows that Mr Parker has been deceived by those who have 'passed over,' or else that since death the great Charles Darwin has forgotten his own teachings, for we are assured that at a spiritual meeting, 'he said that his theory was that man had come from monkeys,' which, of course, never was his doctrine but was the lewd misinterpretation of his theory of evolution and the origin of man made by his opponents. In the central purpose of this small book—the necessity of an inspiring and sympathetic environment for man, the individual and in the mass—we discern a truth; but . . . anyhow, we have shown in this notice that we are able to treat even incredible claims when sincere with respect; and we say this because in our last number a light-hearted reference to Esperanto has loosed on us two or three thunderous letters, of which in a spirit of fair-play we print hereafter one characteristic of them all. But we wear no sheet of penitence for what we gaily said.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the 'Quarterly Review.'

SIR,

I notice on p. 408 of your current issue a statement, purporting to be of fact, which is so untrue and so misleading that I hope you will allow me just enough space in your next issue to contradict it. The reviewer of a book on 'Anglic' says, among statements of opinion which I will not criticise—'Volapuk came and went; Esperanto followed and was found wanting.' It is of course open to the reviewer to condemn Esperanto and to form his own opinion of its chances of success. But his words obviously mean that Esperanto is actually a thing of the past. This is demonstrably false. Esperanto, whatever its merits or its future, is actually very much alive at the present time. The number of Esperantists, though naturally impossible to ascertain completely, runs into many thousands. More than fifty radio stations broadcast talks and lessons in Esperanto. It is regularly and largely used in the International Labour Office at Geneva and by hundreds of commercial firms. Two Professorships in the language have recently been founded, one at Liverpool, the other at Cracow. Many other proofs could be given of the fact that, whatever the future may hold in store, Esperanto at the present time is alive and growing.

A false assertion such as that of your reviewer is, if intended to damage, most dishonourable; if made in ignorance, an act of very culpable indifference to truth.

For a fair and objective view of the existing state of the question of an international language I would refer your readers to the January number of 'Psyche' (Kegan, Paul & Co.), an article by the well-known philologist Professor Jespersen, who is himself not an Esperantist, but the inventor of another language called Novial.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

NOWELL SMITH.

